

## Durham E-Theses

---

### *Scribal Culture and Intertextuality: Literary and Historical Relationships between Job and Deutero-Isaiah*

KWON, JISEONG

#### How to cite:

---

KWON, JISEONG (2015) *Scribal Culture and Intertextuality: Literary and Historical Relationships between Job and Deutero-Isaiah*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/11208/>

#### Use policy

---

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

---

Academic Support Office, Durham University, University Office, Old Elvet, Durham DH1 3HP  
e-mail: [e-theses.admin@dur.ac.uk](mailto:e-theses.admin@dur.ac.uk) Tel: +44 0191 334 6107  
<http://etheses.dur.ac.uk>

# Scribal Culture and Intertextuality: Literary and Historical Relationships between Job and Deutero-Isaiah

By

JiSeong Kwon

Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

At

Durham University

Department of Theology and Religion

2015

## **Abstract**

### **Scribal Culture and Intertextuality: Literary and Historical Relationships between Job and Deutero-Isaiah**

JiSeong Kwon

This thesis examines a variety of scholarly arguments concerning the distinctive literary and historical relationship between the book of Job and the second part of the book of Isaiah, so-called Deutero-Isaiah. The general methodology in a comparative study between biblical texts has been the author-oriented approach which traces the complex interrelationships between corresponding texts, considering many verbal and thematic similarities, but this approach often arises from the misleading concepts of literary dependence from an early source to a later one. In this thesis, I argue that scribes were writers of biblical materials and belonged to a group of the literate élite in Israelite society, and that resemblances between the two books result from the production of a scribal culture in the Persian period. This view may shed a light on traditional researches influenced by form-criticism, which divides the literate groups in Israelite society into different professional groups—priests, sages, and prophets. The proposed approach of the scribal culture has also resulted in a different way of interpreting the association with ancient Near Eastern literature which is supposed to be closely related to the two books. Similarities with non-Israelite sources have been suggested by scholars as unequivocal evidence of literary dependence or influence, but a careful examination of those extra-biblical compositions possibly affirms that scribes would have a broad awareness of other ancient texts. Finally, shared ideas and interests between the two books do offer insights into the theological views of the scribes in the Persian period. We may see the historical development of scribal ideas by comparing the two books with other biblical texts and by confirming the diversity and discrepancy within them.

# Contents

Statement of Copyright .....	iv
Acknowledgements .....	v
Abbreviations .....	vii
Introduction .....	1
The Scope of the Text .....	1
Literature Review .....	4
Assumptions and Methods .....	6
Part I The Distinctive Relationship between Job and Deutero-Isaiah .....	9
Chapter 1 The Comparative Study between Job and Deutero-Isaiah .....	10
1.1 Scholarly Claims of the Relationship between Job and Deutero-Isaiah .....	10
1.2 Critical Reflections .....	25
1.3 Conclusion .....	45
Chapter 2 Resemblances between Job and Deutero-Isaiah .....	48
2.1 Examining Common Themes and Terms .....	48
2.2 Examining Parallel Expressions .....	71
2.3 Conclusion .....	82
Chapter 3 Job and Deutero-Isaiah in the Hebrew Bible .....	84
3.1 Pentateuchal and Deuteronomistic Texts .....	85
3.2 The Book of Jeremiah .....	96
3.3 First and Third Isaiah .....	102
3.4 The Book of Psalms .....	107
3.5 The Book of Lamentations .....	112
3.6 Other Prophetic Books .....	116
3.7 Other Wisdom Books .....	123
3.8 Conclusion .....	126
Part II Scribal Culture in Job and Deutero-Isaiah .....	130
Chapter 4 Scribes and Scribal Culture .....	131
4.1 Scribes as the Literati .....	132
4.2 Scribes as Biblical Writers .....	145
4.3 Education, Textuality, and Enculturation .....	160
4.4 Summary .....	166

4.5	Further Discussion: Sages, Prophets, and Scribal Culture.....	167
4.6	Conclusion .....	179
Chapter 5 Intellectual Background of Job and Deutero-Isaiah.....		181
5.1	Literary Dependence of Job on Foreign Literature.....	183
5.2	Literary Dependence of Deutero-Isaiah on Foreign Literature.....	197
5.3	Job and Deutero-Isaiah in ancient Near Eastern Culture .....	211
5.4	Conclusion .....	220
Chapter 6 Scribal Ideas in Job and Deutero-Isaiah.....		222
6.1	Shared Ideas in Job and Deutero-Isaiah.....	224
6.2	The Context of Job and Deutero-Isaiah .....	254
6.3	Conclusion .....	272
Conclusion .....		274
Bibliography .....		277

## Declaration

I declare that this thesis embodies the results of my own work, that it has been composed by me and that it does not include work that has been presented for a degree in this or any other university. All quotations and the work and opinions of others have been acknowledged in the main text or footnotes.

JiSeong Kwon

## **Statement of Copyright**

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published in any format, including electronic, without the author's prior written consent and all information derived from this thesis must be acknowledged appropriately.



## Acknowledgements

My interest in this subject arose while taking the doctoral course ‘Wisdom Literature’ by Prof. Willem VanGemeren in Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Illinois. While writing the research paper, the *Poetic Expressions in Proverbs 9*, my initial question considered which elements of literary influence Israelite sages used in Isaiah 40-55 and later on I developed this idea in the doctoral programme of Durham University. First of all, I am especially grateful to Prof. Stuart Weeks who first suggested that I consider Judean scribal culture in the Hebrew Bible in this doctoral research. I will never forget his passionate instruction and guidance throughout my PhD study, and the supervision hours at Starbucks helped us to build up fascinating dialogues and stimulated my intellectual curiosity. His knowledge of ancient Near Eastern literature, which I had never had access to, always left me stunned. I would like to express my thanks to my secondary supervisor Prof. Robert Hayward. He always encouraged me with warm words, and provided me with me comprehensive knowledge of Jewish literature in the Second Temple period. Also, I would like to thank Prof. Walter Moberly who supervised my MA thesis which became a foundational work for my PhD research. Dr. Katharine Dell in Cambridge University served for examining this thesis and her comments made up for many deficiencies in the entire argument.

Further, I thank my good friend Dr. Kumiko Jean Takeuchi for being with the race till the end under the same supervisor during the past three years. Tom Judge always gave me hospitality, and we often met to share our intriguing ideas and I am deeply indebted to him for his pastoral care. Many members of Waddington Street United Reformed Church in Durham always welcomed me and gave me love and courage. Especially, Mr. Malcolm Reay, Mrs. Ruth Cranfield, Dr. Arthur Banister/Mrs. Judy Banister, and Revd. Steven Orange carefully read each chapter and corrected numerous mistakes in my thesis. I have to express my special thanks to Mr. Douglas McMurtrie a lay preacher in St. John Church who was willing to read it.

My theological training would not be possible without the financial support of several faithful institutions and churches. *OkhanHum* Scholarship in the *Sarang* Church and ICCC scholarship helped me to continue my MDiv and PhD studies. There were also many small grants from Ustinov College and Durham Theology & Religion department. Above all, I deeply appreciate *Jesus Family Presbyterian Church* and the senior pastor Baek GumSan in South Korea and would like to express thanks to my mentor and friend, Rev. Nam KyungWoo and KCCC staff Jo MiYun.

There was a variety of discussions and feedback from church members, various colleagues and postgraduate students which fostered a clearer understanding of my thesis. While serving in Newcastle Korean Church and London King's Cross Church, and preaching the book of Isaiah and the book of Job in expository series, I received amazing grace from the young generation. The summary of Chapter 2 was presented in the Wisdom Literature session and the summary of Chapter 4 in the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament/Ancient Israel Studies session at the ISBL in conjunction with the annual conference of the EABS at Vienna in 2014. I also gave a paper from the summary of Chapter 2 at the 2014 annual SBL conference in San Diego, CA. Other related topics were presented in the Durham-Sheffield-Manchester PG Day and in the PG Meeting in Durham Theology & Religion department. It was a great privilege to encounter Prof. John Sawyer in the Old Testament seminar, and he kindly read my thesis and provided valuable feedback.

Finally, I am immensely grateful to my parents, HyuckKi Kwon and my mother Jin who have always supported me and have prayed for me. For more than eight years and with greater devotion than any others, my wife GeumSuk has supported me with priceless sacrifice and patience, and my children, Jonathan and Sophia have provided pleasure and happiness at home. Finally I ascribe all the praise and glory to the triune God who initiated and completed this academic pilgrimage from Seoul, to Chicago and Durham. *Soli Deo gloria!*

## Abbreviations

### Biblical Texts, Translations, and Versions

For biblical texts and general ancient texts, I use the abbreviations in ‘The SBL Handbook of Style’ (§8.1-3).

Aq	Aquila
ESV	English Standard Version
JPS	Jewish Publication Society: <i>Tanakh</i> 1985 (English)
LXX	Septuagint (Greek version of the Old Testament)
LXE	English Translation of the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament
MT	Masoretic Text of the Old Testament
NAB	New American Bible
NIV	New International Version
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
RSV	Revised Standard Version
Syr	Syriac Peshitto
Tg	Targum
Vg	Vulgate
11QtgJob	Targum of Job from Qumran, Cave 11

### Monographs, Journals, Periodicals, Major Reference Works, and Series

AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	<i>The Anchor Bible Dictionary</i> . Ed. David Noel Freedman. NY: Doubleday, 1992.
ABRL	The Anchor Bible Reference Library
ABS	Archaeology and Biblical Studies
AEL	Miriam Lichtheim, <i>Ancient Egyptian Literature: A Book of Readings</i> , 3 vols. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1973-1980.
ANE	Ancient Near East
ANET	<i>Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament</i> . Ed. James B. Pritchard. 3rd ed. with supplement. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1969.

AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament
AOS	<i>American Oriental Society</i>
ASTI	<i>Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute</i>
ATANT	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
BA	<i>The Biblical Archaeologist</i>
Balentine	Balentine, Samuel E. <i>Job</i> . Smyth & Helwys Bible commentaries 10. Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys Pub, 2006.
BCOTWP	Baker Commentary on the Old Testament Wisdom and Psalms
BI	<i>Biblical Interpretation</i>
BI:AJCA	<i>Biblical Interpretation: A Journal of Contemporary Approaches</i>
BLS	Bible and Literature Series
BR	<i>Biblical Research</i>
BM	<i>Before the Muses: An Anthology of Akkadian Literature</i> . Ed. Benjamin R. Foster, 3rd ed. Bethesda, MD: CDL Press, 2005.
BN	<i>Biblische Notizen</i>
BO	Biblica et Orientalia
BS	<i>Bibliotheca Sacra</i>
BWL	W. G. Lambert, <i>Babylonian Wisdom Literature</i> . Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960.
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CANE	<i>Civilizations of the Ancient Near East</i> . Ed. Jack M. Sasson. 4 vols. NY: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1995.
CB	Coniectanea Biblica
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBR	<i>Currents in Biblical Research</i>
Cheyne	Cheyne, T. K. <i>Job and Solomon: Or the Wisdom of the Old Testament</i> . London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1887.
Clines	Clines, David J. A. <i>Job 1-20</i> . WBC 17. Dallas: Word Books, 1989; <i>Job 21-37</i> . WBC 18A. Nashville: Nelson, 2006; <i>Job 38-42</i> . WBC 18B. Nashville: Nelson, 2011.
COS	<i>The Context of Scripture</i> . Ed. William W. Hallo and K. Lawson Younger. 3 vols. Leiden; NY: Brill, 1996-2002.
CQR	<i>Church Quarterly Review</i>
Crenshaw	Crenshaw, James L. <i>Reading Job</i> . Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys Pub., 2011.
CRINT	Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
CTJ	<i>Calvin Theological Journal</i>

CTR	<i>Criswell Theological Review</i>
CTSSR	College Theology Society Studies in Religion
DBCI	<i>Dictionary of Biblical Criticism and Interpretation</i> . Ed. Stanley E. Porter. London: Routledge, 2006.
DCH	<i>The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew</i> . Ed. David J. A. Clines. 8 vols. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
Dhorme	Dhorme, E. <i>A Commentary on the Book of Job</i> . Trans. H. Knight. London: Nelson, 1967 [French Original. 1926].
DOTWPW	<i>Dictionary of the Old Testament: Wisdom, Poetry &amp; Writings</i> . Ed. Tremper Longman III and Peter Enns. England: IVP, 2008.
Driver-Gray	Driver, S.R., and G. B. Gray. <i>A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Job together with a New Translation</i> . ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1921.
DTS	Dallas Theological Seminar
ECC	Early Christianity in Context
EJ	<i>Encyclopaedia Judaica</i> . Ed. Fred Skolnik, and Michael Berenbaum. 2nd ed. 26 vols. Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA in association with Keter Publishing House, 2007.
ET	<i>Expository Times</i>
FIOTL	Formation and Interpretation of Old Testament Literature
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
GBSOTS	Guides to Biblical Scholarship; Old Testament Series
Good	Good, Edwin M. <i>In Turns of Tempest: Reading of Job, with a Translation</i> . Stanford: Stanford UP, 1998.
Goldingay	Goldingay, John. <i>A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Isaiah 40-55</i> . Ed. David Payne. ICC 2 vols. London: T&T Clark, 2006
Gordis	Gordis, Robert. <i>The Book of Job: Commentary, New Translation and Special Studies</i> . Moreshet Series: Studies in Jewish History, Literature and Thought vol. 2. NY: JTSA, 1978.
Gray	Gray, John. <i>The Book of Job</i> . Ed. David J. A. Clines. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2010.
GTJ	<i>Grace Theological Journal</i>
Habel	Habel, N. C. <i>The Book of Job</i> . OTL. London: SCM Press, 1985.
HALOT	<i>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Ed. Ludwig Köhler. Leiden, NY: Brill, 1994.
Hartley	Hartley, John E. <i>The Book of Job</i> . Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1988.

HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
HBIS	History of Biblical Interpretation Series
HBT	Horizons in Biblical Theology
HCOT	Historical Commentary on the Old Testament
<i>HS</i>	<i>Hebrew Studies</i>
HSS	Harvard Semitic Studies
<i>HUCA</i>	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
ICC	International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments
IRT	Issues in Religion and Theology
<i>ITQ</i>	<i>Irish Theological Quarterly</i>
IVP	Inter-Varsity Press
<i>JANER</i>	<i>Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions</i>
<i>JAOS</i>	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JBQ</i>	<i>Jewish Bible Quarterly</i>
<i>JCS</i>	<i>Journal of Cuneiform Studies</i>
<i>JEOL</i>	<i>Jaarbericht van het Vooraziatisch—Egyptisch Gezelschap Ex Oriente Lux</i> (Leiden)
<i>JHS</i>	<i>Journal of Hebrew Scriptures</i>
<i>JJS</i>	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
JLCR	Jordan Lectures in Comparative Religion
<i>JNES</i>	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
<i>JP</i>	<i>Journal for Preachers</i>
<i>JQR</i>	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
JSOTSup	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i> , Supplement Series
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
JTSA	Jewish Theological Seminary of America
KAT	Kommentar zum Alten Testament
LAI	Library of Ancient Israel
LBS	The Library of Biblical Studies
Longman III	Longman III, Tremper, <i>Job</i> . Baker Commentary on the Old Testament Wisdom and Psalms. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012.
LHB/OTS	Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies
LSTS	Library of Second Temple Studies

<i>MDOG</i>	<i>Mitteilungen der deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft</i>
MP	Modern Philology
NCB	New Century Bible
NCBC	New Century Bible Commentary
NCoBC	New Collegeville Bible commentary
NERTOT	<i>Near Eastern Religious Texts Relating to the Old Testament</i> . Ed. Walter Beyerlin. London: SCM Press, 1978.
NIB	New Interpreter's Bible
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
<i>NIDOTTE</i>	<i>New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis</i> . Ed. Willem VanGemeren. Carlisle: Paternoster, 1997.
<i>NTT</i>	<i>Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift</i>
NTIC	New Translation with Introduction and Commentary
NODE	<i>The New Oxford Dictionary of English</i> . Ed. Judy Pearsall. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
OAC	Orientis Antiqui Collectio
OBO	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis
OBT	Overtures to Biblical Theology
<i>OCD</i>	<i>The Oxford Classical Dictionary</i> . Ed. Simon Hornblower, Antony Spawforth, and Esther Eidinow. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2012.
<i>ODCC</i>	<i>The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church</i> . Ed. F. L. Cross and Elizabeth A. Livingstone. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1997
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTM	Old Testament Message
OTMs	Oxford Theological Monographs
<i>OTP</i>	<i>Old Testament Parallels: Laws and Stories from the Ancient Near East</i> . Ed. Victor Harold Matthews and Don C. Benjamin. NY: Paulist Press, 1991.
Pope	Pope, M. <i>Job</i> . AB 15. NY: Doubleday, 1965.
<i>PRS</i>	<i>Perspectives in Religious Studies</i>
PUP	Publications of the University of Pretoria
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue Biblique</i>
RBS	Resources for Biblical Study
<i>RE</i>	<i>Review &amp; Expositor</i>
SAA	State Archives of Assyria
SAA 3	Alasdair Livingstone, <i>Court Poetry and Literary Miscellanea</i> . SAA v. 3. Helsinki: Helsinki UP, 1989.

SAA 9	Simo Parpola, <i>Assyrian Prophecies</i> . SAA v. 9. Helsinki: Helsinki UP, 1997.
SAACT	State Archives of Assyria Cuneiform Texts
SB	Studia Biblica
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLSS	Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
SEÅ	<i>Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok</i>
Seow	Seow, C. L. <i>Job 1-21: Interpretation and Commentary</i> . Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2013.
SGKA	Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums
SHBC	Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentaries
SHR	Studies in the History of Religions
SHS	Scripture and Hermeneutics Series
SJT	<i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>
SOTS	Society for Old Testament Study
SOTSMS	Society for Old Testament Study Monograph Series
SPCK	Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge
SPOT	Studies on Personalities of the Old Testament
SAK	Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
SVT	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
TA	Theologische Arbeiten
TB	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
TS	<i>Theological Studies</i>
TDOT	<i>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament</i> . Ed. G. J. Botterweck, H. Ringgren, and H.-J. Fabry. Trans J. T. Willis, G. W. Bromiley, and D. E. Green. 15 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974-2006.
TLOT	<i>Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Ed. Ernst Jenni and Claus Westermann. Trans. Mark E. Biddle. 3 vols. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1997.
Tur-Sinai	Tur-Sinai, N. H. <i>The Book of Job: A New Commentary</i> . Jerusalem: Kiryath Sepher, 1967.
TVZ	Theologischer Verlag Zürich,
Terrien	Terrien, Samuel L. <i>Job</i> . 2e éd. actualisée. Commentaire de l'Ancien Testament 13. Genève: Labor et Fides, 2005.



<i>USQR</i>	<i>Union Seminary Quarterly Review</i>
UCOP	University of Cambridge Oriental Publications
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	Supplements to <i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
Watts	Watts, John D. W. <i>Isaiah 34-66</i> . WBC 25. Nashville: Nelson, 2005.
WAW	Writings from the Ancient World
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WJKP	Westminster John Knox Press
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift Für Die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>

### Miscellaneous

abb.	Abbreviation
BH	Biblical Hebrew
Biblical Studies	BS
cf.	confer, compare
Deutero-Isaiah	DI
Eng.	English Translation
ed(s).	edited by, editor(s)
e.g.	<i>exempli gratia</i> , for example
et al.	and others
HB	Hebrew Bible
<i>hpx</i>	<i>hapax legomenon</i> (lit. ‘being spoken once’)
K	Kethib
lit.	literally
MSS	manuscripts
p(p).	page(s)
pub	publication
Q	Qere
repr.	reprint(ed)
trans.	Translated by; traslator(s)
Univ.	University
UP	University Press
v(v)	verse(s)
vol(s).	volume(s)
WL	Wisdom Literature
x	time(s)

## Introduction

The book of Job and the section of Isaiah known as Deutero-Isaiah (Isa 40-55) have traditionally been considered in the context of different traditions, wisdom and prophecy respectively.

Although they belong to different literary genres, most biblical scholars have pointed out that there is no question about the fact that the two books have a distinctive literary and historical relationship. To establish the relationship between the two books, they have focused on presenting reasonable links based on vocabularies, expressions, forms, genres, motifs, and themes, and have concluded that Job was influenced by Deutero-Isaiah or Deutero-Isaiah depended on texts from Job. In these claims, linguistic similarities have convincingly sustained the possibility of the literary dependence between biblical texts, assuming historical dates and places in which the two books were written.

### *The Scope of the Text*

Before reviewing comparative studies between Job and Deutero-Isaiah, mentioning the extent of the two texts will provide sufficient grounds to support further discussion and argument.<sup>1</sup>

### The Book of Job

It has been widely accepted that literary components such as prose tale (Job 1-2; 42:7-17), dialogue (3-31), Elihu's speech (32-37), and Yahweh's speech (38-42:1-6) in Job were not written at once, but went through a number of redactions by authors for a long duration;<sup>2</sup> this often led interpreters to compare selected passages in Job with the text of Isa 40-55. There are major issues

---

<sup>1</sup> The dating of Job and Deutero-Isaiah and the problem of linguistic dating will be discussed in Chapter 1.

<sup>2</sup> Refer to following commentators; Marvin H. Pope, *Job*, AB 15 (NY: Doubleday, 1965), xxi-xxviii; E. Dhorme, *A Commentary on the Book of Job*, trans. H. Knight (London: Nelson, 1967), lviii-cxi; John Gray, *The Book of Job*, ed. David J. A. Clines (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2010), 56-75; John E. Hartley, *The Book of Job* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1988), 20-33; David J. A. Clines, *Job 1-20*, WBC 17 (Dallas: Word Books, 1989), lvii-lix; C. L. Seow, *Job 1-21: Interpretation and Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2013), 26-39.

of literary integrity and unity to be explained. Firstly, it is common to assume that the prologue and epilogue of Job was already circulated before the composition of the present form, although whether the prose tale was simply attached, was modified, or was newly composed, has produced no consensus. Marvin Pope points out that there are ‘inconsistencies’ between the prose tale and the dialogue, and supports different authorships between them; from several disparities (1) in the characteristic of Job (pious or argumentative); (2) in dogmas about retribution; (3) in divine names (whether or not the use of YHWH).<sup>3</sup> On the contrary, David Clines maintains that the author of the prose tale and the dialogue is the same, in highlighting the literary coherence between the two units from the references of Job 2:11-13, where Job’s friends arrive and console Job, and of 42:7-8 where Yahweh rebukes Job’s friends and commands their atonement.<sup>4</sup> Secondly, Elihu’s speech (Job 32-37) has been treated as a secondary addition, because Elihu is not addressed anywhere before Job 32 and not found in Yahweh’s speech and the epilogue. Some critics have spoken that the style of Elihu’s speech is very different with the rest of the book.<sup>5</sup> The secondary addition of Elihu’s speech is widely accepted, but also some present persuasive reasons for its integrity with the main part of the book.<sup>6</sup> I am more inclined to accept the view of a single composer between the prose tale and dialogues including Elihu’s speech, although there would be the prototype of an old epic before the book.

Thirdly, many have proposed ways of rearranging the dialogues in the third cycle of dialogue (Job 27:13-23).<sup>7</sup> Reconstructions of the material of this cycle have been done by adding Zophar’s speech and increasing Bildad’s speech, in order to make a completely symmetric structure in each cycle. Clines, for instance, rearranges Job’s speech of 26:1-14 into the part of Bildad’s third

---

<sup>3</sup> Pope, *Job*, xxi–xxv.

<sup>4</sup> Clines, *Job 1-20*, lviii. Also refer to Hartley, *Job*, 21–4; Seow, *Job*, 27–9.

<sup>5</sup> Dhorme, *Job*, ciii–cx; S. R. Driver, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Job*, ed. George Buchanan Gray, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1964), xl–xlvi.

<sup>6</sup> Hartley, *Job*, 28–30; Clines, *Job 1-20*, lviii–lix; Seow, *Job*, 31–7.

<sup>7</sup> Pope, *Job*, xxv–xxvi; Hartley, *Job*, 25–6.

speech, and relocates Job's speeches into those of Zophar (27: 7-10, 13-17; 24:18-24; 27:18-23).<sup>8</sup> Even John Hartley, one of the conservative interpreters, proposed the necessity of reconstruction by adding Job 27:13-23 into Bildad's third speech in 25:1-6.<sup>9</sup> In whatever way, the part of the third cycle seems to need rearrangement. Fourthly, the text of Job 28 has been considered as a secondary addition, because the style and content of Job 28 as a well-constructed poem are quite different from the general features of Job's speeches. However, the text of Job 28 is the personal reflection of how hard it is for humans to achieve God's wisdom and how powerless they are in the exploration of divine wisdom. This may possibly match Job's miserable experience, so that it would not be necessary to shift this part into Elihu's speech nor to regard it as a sort of 'interlude'.

While acknowledging various theories of identifying the secondary addition of this book, I here deal with the present form of this book as we have it, rather than attempt to break it into different redactional layers; though I accept that the book of Job went through several modifications over the centuries.

#### Deutero-Isaiah

For the convenience of scholarly discussion, I divide the book of Isaiah into three parts by a classical definition of Bernhard Duhm; First Isaiah (Isa 1-39), Deutero-Isaiah (40-55), and Third Isaiah (56-66).<sup>10</sup> So, in this research Deutero-Isaiah refers to Isa 40-55. The position of Deutero-Isaiah in the book of Isaiah might be much closer to Blenkinsopp's view which sees Deutero-Isaiah as a discrete unit.<sup>11</sup> However, in this research this is neither meant to present Deutero-Isaiah

---

<sup>8</sup> David J. A. Clines, *Job 21-37*, WBC 18A (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2006), 661-3.

<sup>9</sup> Hartley, *Job*, 25-6.

<sup>10</sup> The view of a conservative minority in which the entire book of Isaiah is attributed to the prophet Isaiah in Jerusalem should not be overlooked, if the canonical approach is cautiously taken. Refer to John N. Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 40-66* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 3-6.

<sup>11</sup> Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 40-55: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 19A (NY: Doubleday, 2000), 54-5.

as a completely separate book from the first part of Isaiah,<sup>12</sup> nor to see Deutero-Isaiah only as the framework of the final form of Isaiah.<sup>13</sup> Nor is it my intention to work on the assumption that the later redactional layers in Isa 1-39 (e.g., Isa 34-35) belong to Deutero-Isaiah and that the entire section of Isa 1-55 is written by a single author of Deutero-Isaiah; though this is highly probable.<sup>14</sup> Rather, of necessity, I use this term ‘Deutero-Isaiah’ as the scholarly well-defined partition, in order to examine the claims to the distinctive relationship between Job and Isa 40-55; most of the comparative studies between Job and Deutero-Isaiah, which have been presented until now, take only chapters 40-55 of Isaiah. For this reason, I do not include Isa 34-35 and Isa 56-66 in the text of Deutero-Isaiah, and when it comes to examples dealing with textual connections between Isa 40-66 and other biblical texts, I limit them with affinities of Isa 40-55.<sup>15</sup>

### *Literature Review*

In fact, the resemblances between Job and Deutero-Isaiah have been considered for several centuries in the figure of Yahweh’s servant which has numerous parallels with an innocent sufferer, Job.<sup>16</sup> This, in the modern era of biblical criticism, began with the commentary of T. K. Cheyne who argued that the sufferings and rewards that Job received ‘as an individual and as a type’<sup>17</sup> have significant parallels with those of the Servant of Yahweh in Deutero-Isaiah, and that these two characters, who are recognised by Yahweh after going through calamities and hardships,

---

<sup>12</sup> Claus Westermann, *Isaiah 40-66: A Commentary*, OTL (London: SCM Press, 1969), 28 says that “chs. 40-55 go back in their entirety to Deutero-Isaiah himself, and that their contents represent what he himself preached”.

<sup>13</sup> Brevard S. Childs, *Isaiah* (Louisville, KY: John Knox Press, 2001), 1–5.

<sup>14</sup> H. G. M. Williamson, *The Book Called Isaiah: Deutero-Isaiah’s Role in Composition and Redaction* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005); also see Christopher R. Seitz, *Zion’s Final Destiny: The Development of the Book of Isaiah: A Reassessment of Isaiah 36-39* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991).

<sup>15</sup> In Chapter 3, I will also deal with the interconnections between Deutero-Isaiah and First/Third Isaiah; see the section 3.3.2.

<sup>16</sup> T. K. Cheyne, *The Prophecies of Isaiah: A New Translation with Commentary and Appendices*, vol. 2 (London, 1884), 259–68; Jean Charles Bastiaens, “The Language of Suffering in Job 16-19 and in the Suffering Servant Passages in Deutero-Isaiah,” in *Studies in the Book of Isaiah* (Peeters: Leuven UP, 1997), 421–32; Alan Cooper, “The Suffering Servant and Job: A View from the Sixteenth Century,” in *As Those Who Are Taught* (Atlanta: SBL, 2006), 189–200.

<sup>17</sup> Cheyne, *Prophecies*, 2:264.

have the possibility of mutual dependence. From a different perspective, Robert Pfeiffer asserted that Deutero-Isaiah combines two disparate ideas of a deity; the historical God of Israel and the ‘Edomitic’ God who is presented as the creator of the physical universe as in the book of Job.<sup>18</sup>

The most comprehensive research into the association between Job and Deutero-Isaiah was conducted by Ralph Elliott, who in his PhD thesis<sup>19</sup> argued that, except in the Elihu speeches (Job 32-37) and the passages about the two beasts (Job 40:15-41:26), the author of Job either deliberately used materials from Deutero-Isaiah or unintentionally employed the linguistic and thematic patterns of others as ‘a disciple of the school which continued Deutero-Isaiah’s emphases’.<sup>20</sup> To support the view of the literary dependence of Job on Deutero-Isaiah, he suggested philological aspects of commonality in ‘rhythmic and metric structures’, ‘vocabulary’, ‘syntax’, ‘style’, and ‘the peculiar usage of divine names’, and further theological aspects in common themes of God, man, evil, suffering, and the world.<sup>21</sup> Following the method in determining the direction of the literary dependence which Pfeiffer used, Samuel Terrien, who takes far greater account of verbal resemblances, reached the same conclusion and maintained that Job did not borrow texts from Deutero-Isaiah, but instead *vice versa*.<sup>22</sup> However, according to Terrien, this does not mean that the manuscript of Job would have been known to Deutero-Isaiah in a written form but that it would be well-known through the process of the oral transmission of Job’s texts.

---

<sup>18</sup> Robert H. Pfeiffer, “The Dual Origin of Hebrew Monotheism,” *JBL* 46, no. 3-4 (1927): 194.

<sup>19</sup> Ralph Elliott, “A Comparative Study of Deutero Isaiah and Job” (PhD, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1956).

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 287–90.

<sup>21</sup> See *ibid.*, 158–290.

<sup>22</sup> He addresses that “the Second Isaiah seems to offer an answer to the questions of existence raised by Job”. See Samuel L. Terrien, “Quelques Remarques Sur Les Affinités de Job Avec Le Deutéro-Esaïe,” in *Volume Du Congrès, Genève, 1965*, VTSup 15 (Leiden: Brill, 1966), 309; Samuel L. Terrien, *Job*, 2e éd. actualisée., Commentaire de l’Ancien Testament 13 (Genève: Labor et Fides, 2005), 72–4; Samuel L. Terrien, “The Book of Job: Introduction and Exegesis,” in *IB*, III (NY: Abingdon Press, 1951), 889–90; Terrien argues that the book of Job is not answering the question concerning theodicy which sages of Mesopotamia or Egypt usually discuss, but makes “a contribution to the theology of presence”. See Samuel L. Terrien, *The Elusive Presence: Toward a New Biblical Theology*, RP 26 (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1978), 362.

Differing from the aforementioned scholars who insisted on the authorial intentionality in using an earlier text, J. Gerald Janzen suggested that Job and Deutero-Isaiah have in common the motif of cosmic creation which is firmly associated with mythological images in Mesopotamian and Canaanite literature (cf. Gen 1; Ps 74, 89).<sup>23</sup> According to Janzen, thematic issues of ‘monotheism, power, and justice’ in the trial speeches, in the Cyrus poem, and in the servant poems of Deutero-Isaiah appear to present the supremacy of God’s power.<sup>24</sup> In recent times, interpreters have been moving actively to challenge the previous researches and to adopt the sophisticated method of biblical intertextuality into the comparative study. Two interpreters, C. L. Brinks and Will Kynes take Job’s text to be a parody of Deutero-Isaiah and consider that there were literary allusions in Job to Deutero-Isaiah, rather than direct quotations or borrowings between the two texts.<sup>25</sup>

### *Assumptions and Methods*

Although there are significant insights in those comparative studies, one of the most frequent limits is that they make external comparisons between texts based on linguistic similarities and use them in determining the direction of literary reference. Most explanations of why the two literatures resemble each other are entirely limited to the literary dependence between the two texts, or are narrowed down to the literary influence of a particular literary tradition. Further, for the purpose of investigating commonalities in both texts, it is necessary to designate the cultural and historical background from which the two books originated, and in particular, I propose the idea of scribal culture.

---

<sup>23</sup> See J. Gerald Janzen, “On the Moral Nature of God’s Power: Yahweh and the Sea in Job and Deutero-Isaiah,” *CBQ* 56, no. 3 (1994): 458–78; “Creation and the Human Predicament in Job,” *Ex Auditu* 3 (1987): 45–53.

<sup>24</sup> Janzen, “Nature”; also see “Another Look at God’s Watch over Job (7:12),” *JBL* 108, no. 1 (1989): 109–14. Janzen uses Lind’s claim that Deutero-Isaiah implies the concept of monotheism, that Yahweh alone is God in the cosmos and history. Millard C. Lind, “Monotheism, Power, and Justice: A Study in Isaiah 40–55,” *CBQ* 46, no. 3 (1984): 432–46.

<sup>25</sup> See C. L. Brinks, “The Thematic, Stylistic, and Verbal Similarities between Isaiah 40–55 and the Book of Job” (PhD, University of Notre Dame, 2010); Will Kynes, “Job and Isaiah 40–55: Intertextualities in Dialogue,” in *Reading Job Intertextually*, LHB/OTS (NY: T&T Clark, 2013), 94–105.

In this research, a consideration of the relationship between Job and Deutero-Isaiah will be undertaken by presenting the work in two substantial parts. The first part will scrutinise the validity of the researches concerning the distinctive connection between the two books; from Chapter 1 to 3 (Part I), I will investigate in detail scholarly claims that allege a distinctive literary and historical relationship between Job and Deutero-Isaiah. Chapter 1 will examine types of resemblances between the two books and ways of explaining the historical background of similarities, and will present several weaknesses and limits indicated in the comparative studies of the two books. Chapter 2 will examine whether the assertion of the mutual dependence between the two books can be substantially supported by evidence of general subject-matter and a series of verbal parallels. Chapter 3 will present many comparative studies between Job/Deutero-Isaiah and other biblical texts, and from this survey will assess whether it can be claimed that those resemblances between the two books are distinctive from any other books in the Hebrew Bible.

The second part from Chapter 4 to 6 (Part II) will consider the social and historical background in which the two books originated, and will concentrate mainly on why these verbal and thematic overlaps occur between the two books. Then, scribes as literate experts and their cultural knowledge will be proposed as the broad context in which biblical materials were composed. This thesis submits that, before the final stage of the canonization in the Hellenistic period, many of the present forms of biblical materials were in general produced in the Second Temple period. This does not mean that in the pre-exilic and exilic periods the biblical texts were not written, but there is much evidence that the authoritative prototype of biblical books had been preserved, copied, interpreted, and composed from the pre-exilic period. What I propose here is the broad context of scribes who had memorised their spoken/written texts and had educated the next generations from their inherited collections. In Chapter 4, I will present the scribal culture which has significance in understanding the intellectual environment in the pre-canonical stage of the Hebrew Bible and will further consider why this concept of scribal culture is not employed by a majority of biblical interpreters. In order to view the intellectual milieu around scribes, Chapter 5 will present non-Israelite sources that are supposed by scholars to be similar to the texts of Job and Deutero-Isaiah,



and will evaluate the arguments about the literary relationship with foreign texts. Finally, Chapter 6 will present shared ideas between two scribal texts and will examine diverse thoughts among scribes by comparing them with other biblical texts. The similarities and differences within scribal texts provide significant insights into understanding the literature and the history of contributions to the composition of Job and Deutero-Isaiah.

Specifically, in my argument, the meaning of ‘intertextuality’ by means of a heuristic approach will be reconsidered and reassessed through the example of the link between Job and Deutero-Isaiah, and various interconnections with Israelite and non-Israelite sources will be searched for in the broad context of scribal culture in the Second Temple period. In the explosion of intertextual criticism in Old Testament study, the study of scribalism and scribal culture as related to biblical writings, as I suppose, could shed a fresh light on the chronic problems of many intertextual studies at present, and could frame more appropriate questions to produce a comprehensive survey of what the context behind the Hebrew Bible is.

**Part I The Distinctive Relationship between Job and Deutero-  
Isaiah**

## **Chapter 1 The Comparative Study between Job and Deutero-Isaiah**

As evidence of the distinctive relationship between Job and Deutero-Isaiah, the aforementioned scholars present different levels of commonality, from lexical, form, and thematic correspondences. Then, ways for interpreting overlapping words have been mostly described as the intentional borrowing and awareness of authors, or by more technical terms of literary theory such as ‘quotation’, ‘allusion’, ‘echo’, and ‘influence’. In this chapter as a starting point, I will look at the claims made by scholars that the literary relationship between Job and Deutero-Isaiah is distinctive within the Hebrew Bible. In reviewing their diverse claims in terms of the connection between the two books, I will indicate several types of resemblance and then possible ways of explaining linguistic affinity. Here, I ask: what types of linguistic similarities are adopted commonly in comparing Job and Deutero-Isaiah and how do they explain the phenomena of verbal and thematic similarities between them? As critical reflections, I will examine the limits of the comparative studies which adopt an author-oriented reading. In particular, this will be of importance to this research in reconsidering the nature of the intertextuality imposed by linguistics and by looking at how OT scholars utilise the concept of biblical intertextuality.

### *1.1 Scholarly Claims of the Relationship between Job and Deutero-Isaiah*

#### **1.1.1 Types of Resemblance**

Most interpreters in the comparative study of Job and Deutero-Isaiah by no means dissent from the assertion that there is a close relationship based on certain linguistic resemblances between the two books. However, the primary variation is that they present different levels of commonality from various verbal and thematic correspondences. Those literary evidences of commonality by and large are divided into three types: vocabulary, style/form, and theme/motif.

#### 1.1.1.1 Vocabulary

The most explicit type of commonality between the two books is specific lexical parallels which are identified in vocabulary, phrase, and sentence. When parallels as evidence of literary dependence between Job and Deutero-Isaiah are suggested, the most important factor is the frequency of occurrence in the Hebrew Bible. If a parallel is something only found in the two books, it is likely to receive much attention as a special case of a close association.

Arguing the priority of Job over Deutero-Isaiah, first of all, Robert Pfeiffer classifies parallels into two parts, ‘utterance’ and ‘thought’; the first part includes nineteen common nouns and verbs (under the headings of ‘flora’, ‘fauna’, ‘cosmology’, and ‘miscellaneous’), eight idiomatic expressions, and eight figures of speech;<sup>26</sup> the second part includes similar motifs and thoughts related to ‘the deity’ and ‘man’.<sup>27</sup> However, he neither seeks to explain shared vocabulary by reference to associated motifs, nor examines whether the corresponding items of vocabulary and phrases have similar meanings in each context. Samuel Terrien later fills out previous researches by considering lexical affinities in relation to common forms and themes.<sup>28</sup> He suggests as the common ground of the relationship between the two books three theological motifs: ‘the motif of divine transcendence’ (Job 9:4//Isa 40:26; Job 9:8//Isa 44:24b; Job 9:10//Isa 40:27, 28ab, 29-31), ‘the motif of existence’ (Job 4:19//Isa 45:9, 11; Job 12:10//Isa 42:5), and ‘the motif of Yahweh’s Servant’ (Job 3:23//Isa 40:27a).<sup>29</sup> However, parallel terms used in establishing the relationship between Job and Deutero-Isaiah have been reconsidered to be doubtful in recent studies (Nurmela, Brinks, and Kynes). When a set of verbal links is examined, they reduce it to a minimum (Terrien, Brinks, Kynes) and tend to suggest as reasonable links parallel phrases which mostly appear in Job 9-12 and Isa 40-45. Let us see

---

<sup>26</sup> Pfeiffer, “Dual,” 203–4; also, see Robert H. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (London: Black, 1952), 467.

<sup>27</sup> Pfeiffer, “Dual,” 204–5.

<sup>28</sup> Terrien, “Quelques.”

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 300–8.

some examples. Firstly, setting aside compiled lists of the word-strings by which scholars routinely make the case of the mutual relationship, C. L. Brinks carefully puts forward five significant examples in which Job and Deutero-Isaiah have a common idea of a court scene with God and corresponding wording (Job 9:4//Isa 40:26; Job 9:8//Isa 44:24; Job 9:10//Isa 40:28; Job 9:12//Isa 43:13; Job 9:12//Isa 45:9).<sup>30</sup> Moreover, it is suggested that both Isa 41:20 and Job 12:9 in Job's fourth speech (Job 12-14) form an identical word-string and the common theme of God's action which is also similar to Ps 107:16.<sup>31</sup> Secondly, Risto Nurmela examines only three cases to identify the relationship between Job and Deutero-Isaiah; two cases overlap with Brinks' examples (Job 3:23; 5:9; 9:4, 10//Isa 40:26-28; Job 12:9//Isa 41:20) and another case is added (Job 25:2//Isa 45:7).<sup>32</sup> Thirdly, Kynes suggests as evidence of the textual parallels four corresponding verses: Job 9:10, 5:9//Isa 40:28; Job 9:12, 25:2-4//Isa 45:9, Job 9:12, 11:10//Isa 43:13; Job 5:12-13, 12:17//Isa 44:25.<sup>33</sup> The following ten instances are the most remarkable parallels which recent scholars have put forward.

[Expressions found only in Job and Deutero-Isaiah]

- אַמִּיץ כַּח ('mighty in power') in Job 9:4//Isa 40:26 (Elliott, Terrien, Brinks, Nurmela)
- נָטָה שָׁמַיִם לְבָדּוֹ ('who alone stretched out the heavens') in Job 9:8//Isa 44:24 (Pfeiffer, Terrien, Brinks)
- כִּי יַד־יְהוָה עָשָׂתָה זֹאת ('that the hand of Yahweh has done this') in Job 12:9//Isa 41:20 (Brinks, Nurmela)
- מָפַר ('to frustrate'; hiphil participle,) in Job 5:12//Isa 44:25a (Kynes)
- עָשָׂה שְׁלוֹמִים ('to make peace') in Job 25:2//Isa 45:7 (Nurmela, Kynes)
- נִסְתָּרָה דֶּרֶךְ ('way is hidden') in Job 3:23//Isa 40:27 (Elliott, Nurmela)

[Expressions rarely found in Job and Deutero-Isaiah (other occurrences elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible)]

---

<sup>30</sup> Job's third speech and parts of Deutero-Isaiah here speak of "the idea of going to court with God. See Brinks, "Thematic," 167.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid., 170–5.

<sup>32</sup> Risto Nurmela, *The Mouth of the Lord Has Spoken: Inner-Biblical Allusions in Second and Third Isaiah*, Studies in Judaism (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2006), 8, 12–3, 42.

<sup>33</sup> Kynes, "Job," 9–11.

- **אין חקר** ('beyond investigation) in Job 9:10 (cf. 5:9; 9:10)//Isa 40:28 (cf. also in Ps 145:3; Prov 25:3) (Elliott, Terrien, Nurmela, Brinks, Kynes)
- **מי ישיב** ('who can turn him back?') in Job 9:12a (cf. 11:10; 23:13)//Isa 43:13 (cf. also in Isa 14:27; Jer 2:24) (Elliott, Brinks, Kynes)
- **מה־תעשה** ('what are you doing?') in Job 9:12b (cf. 35:6)//Isa 45:9 (cf. also in Prov 25:8; Eccl 8:4) (Terrien, Pfeiffer, Brinks, Kynes)
- **יהולל** ('to make fool') in Job 12:17//Isa 44:25b (cf. also Eccl 7:7) (Kynes)

In these places, where Job and Deutero-Isaiah talk about God's action, nature, and the human-divine relationship, the resemblances in vocabulary between the two texts seem to be significant.

Furthermore, it is worthwhile to draw out numerous verbal parallels regarding Deutero-Isaiah's 'Suffering Servant' in further detail. They are mostly concentrated in the 'Servant Songs' of Isa 52-53.<sup>34</sup> The most frequently cited example here is that the word **עבדי** ('my servant') in both books links the suffering servant **עבדי** ('my servant' in Isa 52:13; 53:11b) with **אויב עבדי** ('Job my servant' (Job 1:8; 2:3; 42:7, 8a, 8b); the following is the most notable parallels:<sup>35</sup>

- **הכאב** ('suffering') Job 2:13//**מכאבות** ('pain') Isa 53:3b
- **נסתרה** ('hidden') Job 3:23//**וכמסתר** ('as one who hid') Isa 53:3
- **וידכאני** ('(God) to crush me') Job 6:9//**מדכא** ('being crushed') Isa 53:5
- **עמל** ('trouble') Job 7:3//**מעמל** ('out of trouble') Isa 53:11
- **ראי** ('who sees me') Job 7:8//**ונראהו** ('we should look at him') Isa 53:2
- **מות** ('death') Job 7:15//**למות** ('to death') Isa 53:12
- **למפגע** ('target') Job 7:20(*hpx*)//**הפגיע** ('(Yahweh) attacked') Isa 53:6
- **פשעי** ('my transgression') Job 14:17//**ואת־פִּשְׁעֵיהֶם** ('among the sinners') Isa 53:12
- **הכו** ('they have struck') Job 16:10//**מכה** ('being stricken') Isa 53:4
- **חדלו** ('left') Job 19:14//**וחדלו** ('rejected') Isa 53:3
- **נגעה** ('(the hand of God) touched') Job 19:21//**בגוע** ('being stricken') Isa 53:4
- **והשמו** ('be appalled') Job 21:5 (cf. 2:12; 17:8)//**שִׁמְמוּ** ('they were appalled') Isa 52:14
- **רמיה** ('deceit') Job 27:4 (cf. 31:5)//**מרמה** ('deceit') Isa 53:9

<sup>34</sup> Cheyne, *Prophecies*, 2:264–5; Dhorme, *Job*, cliv–clv; Terrien, "Quelques," 308; Cooper, "Suffering," 195–6; Brinks, "Thematic," 146–7.

<sup>35</sup> Furthermore, although there is no identical vocabulary, the following verses deal with the similar issue of Suffering Servant; Job 1:8//Isa 53:9; Job 2:7, 7:5//Isa 53:3–4; Job 19:18//Isa 53:3; Job 42:10//Isa 53:12; Job 42:8, 10//Isa 53:12; Job 42:13, 16//Isa 53:10.

- לא־חַמַּס ('no justice') Job 16:17//לא־חַמַּס ('no injustice') Isa 53:9
- קְבָרָיו ('graveyard') Job 17:1//קְבָרוֹ ('his grave') Isa 53:9
- וְתִתְבַּנֵּן ('you consider') Job 30:20//הֵתְבוּנוּ ('they understand') Isa 52:15
- וְבוֹז ('contempt') Job 31:34//נִבְזָה ('He was despised') Isa 53:3a

There are other references to the servant poems in Deutero-Isaiah which make parallels with Job's texts (Isa 49:1-6; 50:4-9; Job 16, 17, 19).<sup>36</sup>

#### 1.1.1.2 *Style and Form*

The second type of resemblance used for establishing the relationship between Job and Deutero-Isaiah is that of literary style and form. I here present three similar styles and two additional common forms among examples suggested by other scholars; though these cases are not only found in the two books, but also can be seen in other biblical texts.

Firstly, with regard to adverbs and conjunctions, both books prefer using the negative particle, בֹּל ('not'; Job 41:15; seven times in Isa 40:24; 43:17; 44:8, 9; cf. Psalms, Proverbs, Isa 14-35) and the conjunction, וְ (fourteen times in Isa 40-48; four times in Job; cf. Isa 26-35; Psalms).<sup>37</sup> Secondly, a series of clauses begin with participles to speak of attributes of a deity with the article (Isa 40:22f; 43:16f; 44:26b-28; Job 5:10a; 9:5-7) or without the article (Isa 44:24-26a; 45:7, 18; 46:10f; 51:13, 15; cf. 56:8; 63:12f; Job 5:9, 10b, 12f; 9:8-10; 26:7-10).<sup>38</sup> Thirdly, both books take the common form of the rhetorical questions introduced by מַה (Isa 40:12-17; Job 34:13; 36:22-23; 38:5-41)<sup>39</sup> which is used for presenting the incomparable power and wisdom of Yahweh. For instance, in Isa 40:12-17, Roy Melugin draws attention to the structure of "disputation genre" which is constituted by disputation and argues that both Isa 40:12-17 and Job 38-39 in Yahweh's speech overlap each other in the common usage of מַה questions (cf.

---

<sup>36</sup> Bastiaens, "Suffering," 421-30.

<sup>37</sup> Pfeiffer, *Introduction*, 467.

<sup>38</sup> Pfeiffer believes that Deutero-Isaiah adopted the first and second characteristics under the literary influence of the book of Job; *Ibid.*, 468.

<sup>39</sup> Brinks, "Thematic," 123.

Prov 30:1-4);<sup>40</sup> a similar form of lawsuit is found between Elihu's speech and Isa 40:12-31 (Job 36:23//Isa 40:12-13; Job 35:5//Isa 40:26).<sup>41</sup> In the lawsuit form, the verse Job 41:1 which consists of the concluding segment of Yahweh's speech (Job 40:25-41:3) after rhetorical questions end with the interrogative וְהָאֵל, which shows the powerlessness of humans compared with Leviathan whom Yahweh created and this same style is found in Isa 40:15.<sup>42</sup>

Moreover, there are two common literary forms (*Gattungen*). Firstly, they take a judicial and disputational form using *rīb*-pattern (רִיב) and lawsuit terminologies (Isa 41:11; 21-24; 45:9; 49:25; 50:8; 51:22; Job 9:3; 10:2; 13:6-19; 23:6; 31:35; 33:13; 35:14).<sup>43</sup> This generally includes the verb רִיב ('to argue') and other related words in court setting—מִשְׁפָּט ('judgment') and צִדִּיק ('righteousness'). According to Terrien, the form of a legal disputation in Job is employed entirely from Job's speeches with friends and God (Job 9:2b-3, 32; 14:3) to Job's 'oath of innocence' (Job 31:35) and Yahweh's summoning (Job 40:7-9, 10-14); 'If one wished to dispute (לִרְיֵב) with him, one could not answer Him once in a thousand times' (Job 9:3). On the other hand, in the *rīb*-pattern of Deutero-Isaiah, the plaintiff is not a human, but a deity, and the defendant to the disputation is expanded from the Israelites to all of humanity;<sup>44</sup> e.g., 'Let them approach, then let them speak; let us together draw near for judgment (לְמִשְׁפָּט)' (Isa 41:1). Secondly, they also commonly cite 'the nature list' in each book. Yahweh's speech in Job

---

<sup>40</sup> This form has been regarded as the typical form of wisdom discourse. Roy F. Melugin, "Deutero-Isaiah and Form Criticism," *VT* 21, no. 3 (1971): 330–1.

<sup>41</sup> Meindert Dijkstra, "Lawsuit, Debate and Wisdom Discourse in Second Isaiah," in *Studies in the Book of Isaiah* (Louvain: Leuven UP, 1997), 259; John B. Curtis, "Elihu and Deutero-Isaiah: A Study in Literary Dependence," in *Proceedings, Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Societies*, vol. 10 (Cincinnati: Eastern Great Lakes & Midwest Biblical Societies, 1990), 34.

<sup>42</sup> Melugin, "Deutero-Isaiah," 332–3; Roy F. Melugin, *The Formation of Isaiah 40-55* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1976), 32–3.

<sup>43</sup> I translated Gunnel André, "Deuterocesaja Och Jobsboken: En Jämförande Studie," *SEA* 54 (1989): 33–42 by the aid of translation programme and Swedish-English dictionary. Curtis, "Elihu," 10:36.

<sup>44</sup> Terrien, "Quelques," 304.



includes a nature list which describes the physical universe and the animal world (Job 38-39),<sup>45</sup> while Deutero-Isaiah often uses it in hymnic form (Isa 40:12-17; 41:18-20; 43:20). John Curtis, in particular, points out meteorological figures—‘rain’ (Isa 45:8; 55:10; Job 36:27-28; 37:6), ‘snow’ (Isa 55:10; Job 37:6), and ‘scorching wind’ (Isa 49:10; Job 37:17).<sup>46</sup>

### *1.1.1.3 Theme and Motif*

The third type of resemblance used to argue for a relationship between Job and Deutero-Isaiah is that of common theme and motif. Here I divide important thematic patterns into five categorisations: divine nature and action, creation, human weakness, the relationship between God and humans, and innocent sufferer. The most distinctive theme selected from both books is divine nature and action. For instance, Terrien emphasises the motif of divine transcendence and Pfeiffer, discussing the idea of monotheism in Deutero-Isaiah, speaks of God the Creator who has supreme power over the physical world. God possesses mighty power (Job 9:4; Isa 40:26) and understanding (Job 26:12; Isa 40:14), and is unfathomable (Job 5:9; 9:10; Isa 40:28), unstoppable (Job 9:12; 11:10; 23:13; Isa 43:13), omniscient (Job 21:22; Isa 40:14), and incomparable (Job 10:7; Isa 43:13), while his way is hidden from humans (Job 3:23; Isa 40:27). God’s unlimited power also extends over individuals and nations: God ‘frustrates’ ‘the devices of the shrewd’ (Job 5:12; cf. 15:4; 16:12; 40:8) and ‘the sign of diviners’ (Isa 44:25), and ‘makes fools’ of human authorities and their wisdom (Job 12:17; Isa 44:25). And the foundation of Job’s or Israel’s suffering and deliverance is the action of God himself: ‘the hand of Yahweh has done this’ (Job 12:9; Isa 41:20).

---

<sup>45</sup> Heinz Richter, “Die Naturweisheit Des Alten Testaments in Buche Hiob,” *ZAW* 70, no. 1-2 (1958): 1–20.

<sup>46</sup> Curtis, “Elihu,” 10:36.

The second noteworthy theme is the creation of the world.<sup>47</sup> God's power is portrayed in the creative act in which Yahweh 'stretches out heavens' (Job 9:8; Isa 40:22; 44:24) and 'lays down the foundation of the earth' (Job 38:4; Isa 48:13), using cosmological terms—'circuit' (חוג) (Job 22:14; 26:10; Isa 40:22; 44:13) and 'to the ends of the earth' (לקצות־הארץ) (Job 28:24; Isa 40:28). Particularly, the 'creation' motif is habitually exemplified in the imagery of the divine battle and in mythological figures such as 'Rahab' (רהב) (Job 9:13; 26:12; Isa 51:9), 'Tanin' (תנין) (Job 7:12; Isa.51:9), and Sea (ים) (Job 26:12; Isa 51:15).<sup>48</sup>

Thirdly, the weakness and finitude of humanity are an important theme. Humans are burdened with hard work and suffering (Job 7:1; 10:17; 14:14; Isa 40:2), and are weak and fragile being like 'clay' (חמר) which is fashioned by its maker (Job 10:9; Isa 45:9), like 'a garment eaten by moths' (Job 13:28; Isa 50:9; 51:8), and like a 'worm' or a 'maggot' (Job 25:6; Isa 41:14). Humans are thoroughly dependent on a deity who gives 'breath' (נשמה) and 'spirit' (רוח) (Job 12:10; 27:3; Isa 42:5). Their fragility and weakness are clearly presented in the final destiny of the wicked by divine judgment like withering grass (Job 8:12; Isa 40:7-8). Furthermore, the two books use a series of human authorities such as 'judges', 'counsellors', 'nations' (Job 12:17, 21, 23; Isa 40:13-15, 17) to emphasise the nothingness of mankind compared with Yahweh. The hidden way (נסתרה דרך) by God is the main cause of human despair—Israelites complain that their way is 'hidden from Yahweh' (Isa 40:27) and foreign people praises God who hides himself (Isa 45:15), while Job laments his suffering, saying why light is given to a man 'whose way is hidden' (Job 3:23)—and humans cannot 'perceive' (בין) God (Job 9:11; 23:8; Isa 44:18). In particular, Janzen acknowledges the unique connotation of 'suffering servitude or troubled

---

<sup>47</sup> Brinks, "Thematic," 193.

<sup>48</sup> Pfeiffer, "Dual," 201; Terrien, "Quelques," 305–6; Janzen, "Nature."

life' (Job 7:1; 14:1; Isa 40:2; cf. Dan 10:1) in the term צבא, other than the conventional meaning—'armies', or 'warfare' (cf. 2 Sam 3:23).<sup>49</sup>

The fourth common theme is the relationship between God and humans. God in Job is recognised as a 'redeemer' (גאל) who will vindicate Job's innocence (Job 19:25) and is similarly depicted as a 'redeemer' ('vindicator' or 'champion') of Israel in Deutero-Isaiah (Isa 41:14; 44:6, 24; 47:4; 48:17; 49:7, 26; 54:5, 8). Or God (as accuser and judge) and humanity (defender) appear as each party of a lawsuit, asking 'who will contend with me?' (מי יריב) (Job 13:19; Isa 50:8; cf. Job 23:6; 40:2; Isa 51:22). Furthermore, the relationship between God and humans according to Henry Rowold is created as rivalry in 'challenge-question' in Yahweh's speech (Job 38:2-3; 40:7-14; Isa 40:12; 41:2a, 4).<sup>50</sup>

Finally, the most common theme of the two books is the model of innocent sufferer. In the history of interpretation of the book of Job, scholars (Cheyne, Dillman, Peake, Kuenen, Hartley, Dhorme, Cooper, Bastesian, Terrien, Brinks, and von Rad) have seen the figure of Job as corresponding with the 'Suffering Servant' in Deutero-Isaiah. For instance, Cheyne proposes seven strong affinities between the two texts: Yahweh's righteous servant, leprosy, disfigured form, mockery and desertion by people, restoration and reward, intercession for others, and triumphant life after suffering.<sup>51</sup> Jean Bastiaens compares verbal and stylistic patterns in the Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah with the description of the innocent sufferer shown in Job's speeches in Job 16-17, 19 (Job 16:10//Isa 50:6; Job 16:17//Isa 53:9) and with the inevitable fate of the wicked in Bildad's speech (Job 18:5-21//Isa 52:14a; 53:4a, 8).<sup>52</sup> Unlike Cheyne, Bastiaens proposes that the two characters of Job and the Servant are not identical, and have

---

<sup>49</sup> Janzen, "Nature," 469.

<sup>50</sup> Henry Rowold, "Yahweh's Challenge to Rival: The Form and Function of the Yahweh-Speech in Job 38-39," *CBQ* 47, no. 2 (1985): 207-8.

<sup>51</sup> Cheyne, *Prophecies*, 2:264-5.

<sup>52</sup> Bastiaens, "Suffering," 432.

many differences in their natures, causes, and purposes but that both books, which include similar language and symbolism concerning the problem of suffering, respond to questions about ‘human conduct, human suffering and the justice of God’.<sup>53</sup> A different approach is taken by Alan Cooper, who follows the exegetical model of Eliezer Ashkenazi, the sixteenth century Jewish commentator, who was convinced that Job was a symbolic figure of innocent suffering and represented the exiled Israelites. To prove the intra-biblical relationship between the two books, Cooper highlights eighteen keywords in parallel proof-texts (cf. Isa 53:9//Job 16:17) suggested by Ashkenazi.<sup>54</sup> In the context of the Servant Song of Isa 52:13-53:12, according to Cooper, the theme of the Servant’s suffering in the two books was designed to ‘convey a message of hope to the Jews’.<sup>55</sup>

### 1.1.2 Types of Explanation Offered

Given three sorts of similarities—vocabulary, style/form, theme/motif—presented as evidence of the distinctive relationship between Job and Deutero-Isaiah, how have biblical scholars explained such explicit phenomena? Generally, current scholarship categorises verbal overlaps between texts as ‘quotations’ or ‘allusions’ if there is perceived to be authorial intention, while they are called ‘echoes’ when intentionality is absent.<sup>56</sup> Definitions of various terminologies such as ‘allusion’, ‘quotation’, ‘echo’, and ‘influence’, however, have not reached a scholarly consensus. Here, types of explaining them may generally be divided by three cases; explicit and intentional reference, implicit reference, and reference to common literary sources.<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> Ibid.

<sup>54</sup> Cooper, “Suffering,” 198.

<sup>55</sup> Ibid., 198.

<sup>56</sup> Will Kynes, *My Psalm Has Turned into Weeping: Job’s Dialogue with the Psalms*, BZAW 437 (Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 2012), 31–3.

<sup>57</sup> For these terms, I referred to definitions by Kynes. See *ibid.*, 31–3.

### 1.1.2.1 *Explicit and Intentional Reference*

The first method of explaining resemblances is that the author of one book intentionally referred to the whole or parts of the other. If this account, for the most part, is right, one author should have been aware of the other specific book and could noticeably embody the vocabularies, forms, and themes of the other into his own work; those similarities result from the direct inspiration of borrowing or quotation. Some interpreters, claiming explicit intentional reference, argue that Deutero-Isaiah referred to the book of Job rather than that the author of Job consulted the work of Deutero-Isaiah.<sup>58</sup> Cheyne, for instance, argues that each author would be aware of works of the other and used those which come from the same historical milieu, but he claims the priority of the book of Job, that Job's passages were directly quoted in Isaiah's passages.<sup>59</sup> He maintains that 'there could be no design in this partial coincidence', but that the book of Job, to some extent, facilitated the formation of Deutero-Isaiah and influenced it, in order to prepare Israelites for the Messianic era in human history.<sup>60</sup> In another place, he provides twenty-one parallels in other similar themes apart from the theme of personal suffering, and among those, only two cases (Job 26:12, 13//Isa 51:9b, 10a; Job 16:17//Isa 53:9) at least are considered as the 'imitation' of Job's texts in Deutero-Isaiah.<sup>61</sup>

Likewise, Pfeiffer's claim is that 'one of the two authors was acquainted with the other' and 'in no cases is Job clearly the borrower,' and 'in some cases Job appears to be the source of Second Isaiah.'<sup>62</sup> Pfeiffer's claim, that Deutero-Isaiah has borrowed from Job, is dependent on two assumptions—that the nature of God in Job is shaped by Edomitic wisdom,<sup>63</sup> and that Deutero-

---

<sup>58</sup> Except for Elliott, "Comparative."

<sup>59</sup> But those resemblances in the theme of the Suffering Servant are not caused by intentional reference, but by coincidence on similar themes, since the original part of the Servant poems in Deutero-Isaiah according to Cheyne is probably regarded as a predecessor of the book of Job. T. K. Cheyne, *Job and Solomon: Or the Wisdom of the Old Testament* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1887), 84.

<sup>60</sup> Cheyne, *Prophecies*, 2:267.

<sup>61</sup> Cheyne, *Job*, 84; Cheyne, *Prophecies*, 2:250.

<sup>62</sup> Pfeiffer, "Dual," 202–3.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, 198; also see Robert H. Pfeiffer, "Edomitic Wisdom," *ZAW* 44, no. 1 (1926): 13–25.

Isaiah (cf. Isa 40) highlights a ‘monotheistic doctrine’ which is totally absent in Job.<sup>64</sup> Terrien claims that Job could not have known Deutero-Isaiah, because the author of Job omits the motif of creation, and the idea of the vicarious suffering in Job is scattered in different passages.<sup>65</sup> Finally, Cooper also supports a direct referential relationship between Job and Deutero-Isaiah, citing Ashkenazi’s intertextual study; Ashkenazi says that similar words in Deutero-Isaiah prove that they come from Job:

*[Isaiah] repeated them verbatim: “Behold, my servant shall prosper” [Isa 52:13]. In other words, behold Job (already referred to as “my servant”), who was utterly abased, yet prospered and rose to the heights.*<sup>66</sup>

From the reference of Ezekiel 14: 14, 20 (‘Noah, Daniel, and Job’) and Ashkenazi’s comments—e.g., ‘all of Isaiah’s words in this passage can be found precisely among the words of Job’—Cooper claims that Isaiah directly referred to Job.<sup>67</sup>

#### *1.1.2.2 Implicit Reference*

In the comparative study of verbal parallels, recent studies have tended to talk about implicit references to earlier texts; the implicit and intentional reference to earlier texts as ‘allusion’; the implicit and unintentional reference as ‘echo’.<sup>68</sup> For instance, Curtis considers that the author of Job intentionally is using Deutero-Isaiah’s text, in order to create the persona of Elihu as a sacred man; Curtis submits that ‘the author of Elihu speeches knew well the thought and

---

<sup>64</sup> Pfeiffer, “Dual,” 205–6.

<sup>65</sup> Terrien, “Job: Introduction,” 889–90.

<sup>66</sup> Cooper, “Suffering,” 197–8.

<sup>67</sup> Ibid., 194–5.

<sup>68</sup> According to Kynes, two terms, “quotation” and “allusion” could be partly identical in that “allusion” along with quotation includes authorial “intentionality” which recalls a previous text. However, on the other hand, the meaning of “allusion” is overlapped with “echo” which has unintentionality. See Will Kynes, “My Psalm Has Turned into Weeping: The Dialogical Intertextuality of Allusions to the Psalms in Job” (PhD, University of Cambridge, 2011), 30–2. Indeed, the definition is not distinguishable among scholars. Brinks in the verbal dependence on Isa 50 and 53 interchanges “allusion” with “echo”, while Kynes separates them by authorial intentionality. See Brinks, “Thematic,” 186. “Allusion” according to Sommer includes “echo” as a weak allusion. See Benjamin D. Sommer, *A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40–66* (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1998), 6–31.

teachings of Deutero-Isaiah,’ but ‘these borrowings are not quotation’;<sup>69</sup> by depending on texts of Deutero-Isaiah, the author of Job reinforces the issues of God, humans, and suffering that are earlier raised in Deutero-Isaiah. Some do not think that historical context is important in deciding the direction of literary dependence. Bastiaens, for instance, argues that linguistic commonalities concerning the suffering servant cannot ‘lead to a kind of identification of Job and the Servant’, but shows that they specifically use the common language of suffering (Job 16-19; Isa 49; 50; 53); nonetheless, he suggests that texts of Job are reminiscent of the Servant in Deutero-Isaiah or the passages of Deutero-Isaiah are implicitly reflecting the text of Job (Job 16:10//Isa 50:6; Job 16:17//Isa 53:9).<sup>70</sup>

There are some scholars who do not draw a clear line between quotation and allusion rejecting the case of the unintentional reference to earlier sources, and who confidently assert the source of literary dependence. For instance, Nurmela in his intertextual study in Isaiah 40-66 does not discuss examples of ‘unconscious allusion’, but says that ‘all the similarities’ which he addresses ‘result from conscious borrowing.’<sup>71</sup> Nurmela’s studies of three parallels between Deutero-Isaiah and Job only include both the quotation and allusion as conscious reference.<sup>72</sup> He argues that the first case of parallels (Job 3:23; 5:9; 9:4, 10//Isa 40:26:28) is literary allusion; ‘Isa 40:26-28 displays ‘a chiasmic structure of allusion’ to Ps 147 and Job’.<sup>73</sup> The second similarity of Isa 41:20 and Job 12:9 is classified as the conscious quotation of Deutero-Isaiah over Job. The third similarity in Isa 45:7 and Job 25:2 is claimed as allusion.

---

<sup>69</sup> Curtis, “Elihu,” 10:37.

<sup>70</sup> Bastiaens, “Suffering,” 432.

<sup>71</sup> Although he says, “quotation and allusion must have been possible already at the stage of oral tradition, and we cannot determine the form in which the prophets were acquainted with e.g. Isaiah 1-39, whether it was oral or written”, he only considers conscious quotation and allusion which can be traceable to the previous sources. Nurmela, *Mouth*, 4-5.

<sup>72</sup> Ibid., 8, 12-3, 42.

<sup>73</sup> Ibid., 8.

Brinks' conclusion about the relationship between the two books seems to distinguish 'allusion' from 'echo' according to the nature of resemblances. Firstly, there are strong verbal parallels to consider, that the author of Job was aware of the language of Deutero-Isaiah and made conscious reference and dependence to them. However, Job's author implicitly parodied the messages of Ps 107 and Deutero-Isaiah (Job 9:2-12; 12:7-25; Isa 40:26; 44:24; 41:20) rather than directly quoting them. Secondly, when looking at several examples of verbal similarities with regard to the innocent sufferer, the author of Job alludes to and echoes words and ideas from the third and fourth servant poems. Brinks, however, does not certainly distinguish allusion from echo:

*[T]he author of Job would be simply echoing the language of a precursor text without attempting to misinterpret or change the meaning. ... alluding allows the author to pack another text's content into a few well-chosen and familiar words. ... echoing a few key words from Isaiah 50-53 would have communicated his point succinctly yet powerfully.<sup>74</sup>*

Similar with Brinks' conclusion, Kynes using synchronic and diachronic ways of intertextual theory maintains that verbal parallels in the two books prove to be the intentional parody;<sup>75</sup> the parody of previous texts assumes conscious adaptation from another, whether it is explicit or implicit.

### *1.1.2.3 Reference to a Common Literary Source*

Contrary to the two previous explanations, this case does not assume that a later author used other specific texts as a reference. Instead, it is considered that similarities resulted from the adoption of Israelite literary traditions or from the usage of non-Israelite resources which were widely known to biblical writers in the same milieu. It is very common for biblical interpreters

---

<sup>74</sup> Brinks, "Thematic," 186.

<sup>75</sup> Brinks and Kynes use the conclusion of Dell's claim, that passages of Job misuse a conventional hymnic form and parody it. See Katharine J. Dell, *The Book of Job as Sceptical Literature*, BZAW 197 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1991). However, they are both arguing that there was literary allusion between Job and Deutero-Isaiah.



in this area to assume that Job and Deutero-Isaiah take over certain traditional forms of prophetic lawsuit or wisdom disputation. James Crenshaw, for instance, insists that the commonality between the two books can be understood in the adoption of a popular *Gattung*, a prophetic *Streitgespräch* ('disputation').<sup>76</sup> The dialogue in the book of Job, according to Crenshaw, has a much closer relationship with covenant lawsuit than with 'a paradigm of an answered lament', and the prophetic *Streitgespräch* as a controversy dialogue which belongs to one of the forms of 'wisdom literature' 'has contributed to the genre as found in Job and explains the kinship with II Isaiah.'<sup>77</sup> Rowold proposes a 'challenge to rival genre' by comparing the similar literary form between forensic *Sitz im Leben* in Yahweh's speeches (Job 38-39) and the disputation/trial speeches in Deutero-Isaiah.<sup>78</sup>

Another explanation suggests that the major reason for the affinity between the two books is that both authors utilise mixed literary forms and traditions. Gunnel André, for example, supports that three different literary models such as Hittite vassal-treaty, myth, and biblical covenant influenced the literary form of *rib*-pattern in Job and Deutero-Isaiah.<sup>79</sup> She concludes that the authors of Job and Deutero-Isaiah deliberately transformed well-known literary genres and terms in each context, in order to express Yahweh's action with his people and his enemies. In a different way, Janzen claims that the two books use the motif of cosmic conflict in an unconventional way, but that the commonality is derived from widespread Babylonian, Canaanite myths, and 'the Priestly cosmology of Genesis 1'.<sup>80</sup> According to Janzen, such a

---

<sup>76</sup> James L. Crenshaw, "Popular Questioning of the Justice of God in Ancient Israel," *ZAW* 82, no. 3 (1970): 388–9.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, 389.

<sup>78</sup> Rowold, "Rival"; Edward L. Greenstein, "A Forensic Understanding of the Speech from the Whirlwind," in *Texts, Temples, and Traditions* (IN: Eisenbrauns, 1996), 254.

<sup>79</sup> André, "Deuterojesaja."

<sup>80</sup> With regard to the reference to creation in Deutero-Isaiah, Janzen says that "the various divine references to cosmic ordering in Deutero-Isaiah contain no hint of this motif of conflict. ... when it is placed alongside the reversal of the motif in Job, and when it is considered alongside the absence of conflict in creation depicted in Genesis 1 and the closely related Psalms 104, the conclusion is invited that its absence in Deutero-Isaiah is deliberate, that it stands, perhaps, in dialectical contrast to

treatment of mythological figures in Job 38:8-11, 40:15-41:34 and in Isa 51:9 contrasts with the prevailing views of divine conflict and reverses 'Job's reiterated motif of God's conflict with the Sea'.<sup>81</sup> Finally, Brinks, with the cases of allusion shown in the second type, adds another explanation; resemblances about God's 'creation' in the two books are the result of interacting with creation traditions, particularly with the Priestly account of creation.<sup>82</sup>

## 1.2 Critical Reflections

This claim on literary reference has so far been applied to most comparative studies, and to intertextual study in recent decades; such interpretations of the origin of resemblances are also found in other comparative studies between Job/Deutero-Isaiah and other biblical materials. But, determining the direction of literary dependence has been a much harder task than scholars have commonly presumed. In order to find possible answers concerning the historical setting of various similarities, they to some degree use assumptions of the historical criticism of the Old Testament as the representative means of 'author-centered' reading. Such an approach has constituted the backbone of explaining similarities between Job and Deutero-Isaiah.<sup>83</sup> However, although historical criticism has made remarkable strides in perceiving the historical setting of biblical books, it has to some extent accepted questionable premises of biblical dating or has depended on conjectures with regard to the authors' preferences and their literary intentions. For instance, when Cheyne argues the priority of Job over Deutero-Isaiah, except for the Servant song (Isa 52:13-53:12), he does not give any definite clue about why he reaches this conclusion. The dependence of Deutero-Isaiah on Job imposed by Pfeiffer begins with guesswork, that 'Edomitic wisdom' influenced the unique view of God in Job. Elliott's view,

---

Babylon's own account of creation, *Enuma elish*. ... Deutero-Isaiah favored image of cosmos as tent may be taken to connect with the Priestly cosmology of Genesis 1". Janzen, "Nature," 473-4.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, 473.

<sup>82</sup> Brinks, "Thematic," 234-5.

<sup>83</sup> Historical criticism has played an important role in restoring the original meaning of the Hebrew Bible, in providing a broad knowledge of *Sitz im Leben* behind the text, and in reconstructing the history of the formation of the Hebrew Bible.

the borrowing of Job on Deutero-Isaiah, is based on unclear clues; that the book of Job mainly emphasises the individual issue of suffering, while Deutero-Isaiah highlights the national issue, and that Job was written in 500-400 BCE and Deutero-Isaiah in 546-536 BCE.<sup>84</sup> Besides, it is very difficult to comprehend the psychologically complex and hidden intentions of authors in making their texts, and to assess whether the origin of the similarities was caused by literary reference, or by unknown sources drawn from other civilizations.<sup>85</sup> Determining whether later texts used earlier ones consciously or unconsciously and which one is used as an earlier or a later certainly needs more caution.

### 1.2.1 Limits of Literary Reference

It would be plausible to trace an earlier source from later sources, by demarcating areas of interpretation and by confirming the chronological order of Israelite and non-Israelite texts.<sup>86</sup> However, the discussion of literary reference as to the relation between Job and Deutero-Isaiah seems to remain unresolved. If one supports the assumption of the literary dependence/influence, it is necessary to confirm the following issues: (1) the nature of ancient texts; (2) the existence of precise analogy; (3) the dating of texts.

#### 1.2.1.1 *The Nature of Ancient Texts*

Firstly, if the textual reference by an author occurred in a specific period, the collection of books such as the book of Job and the book of Deutero-Isaiah in the modern sense should have

---

<sup>84</sup> Furthermore, he asserts that the book of Job “is the individualistic expression, the diction, the sprinkling of Aramaisms, the idiomatic syntax, and the boldness of expression, coupled with the problem-searching method, the angelology, the ethical ideas, the accepted monotheism, and the reach for an after-life, which would lead the present author to set the date for Job”. Ibid., 288–90.

<sup>85</sup> Schökel, for instance, suggests limits of historical criticism in explaining “the author” and “the author’s influence”. See Luis Alonso Schökel, *A Manual of Hermeneutics* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 44–7.

<sup>86</sup> For instance, see David M. Carr, “Method in Determination of Direction of Dependence,” in *Gottes Volk Am Sinai : Untersuchungen Zu Ex 32-34 Und Dtn 9-10*, ed. Matthias Köckert and Erhard Blum (Gütersloh: Chr. Kaiser, 2001), 107–40.

existed. However, when considering the oral-literary culture of Israel, it is doubtful whether an author could possibly have access to such literary materials as a sort of book. Karel van der Toorn argues that the origin of the word, ‘book’ is Greek, ‘biblia’ and the concept of the Bible as one book or a collection of books began from the second century BCE as a Hellenistic invention.<sup>87</sup> Such a concept of a ‘book’ of canonical corpus which is supposed to be the outcome of rabbinic discussion is an anachronism.<sup>88</sup> For instance, what we can confirm in the case of Job is no more of a clue than that, as Marvin Pope says, ‘the recovery of portions of Targum of Job from the Qumran Caves indicate that the book must have been in circulation for some time before the first century B.C.’<sup>89</sup>

The next premise to be confirmed is about the nature of authorship in antiquity. Proposals concerning literary reference usually start with an author as the identifiable originator of a book. However, as a matter of fact, the traditional concept of individual authorship of the Hebrew Bible alleged by scholars is grounded on a modern idea, not on the ancient writing culture. According to van der Toorn, ‘anonymity’ was a prevalent custom of literary production in ancient Mesopotamia, Egypt, and Israel, even until the Hellenistic era.<sup>90</sup> If the scholarly consensus is right that the book of Job has been developed in multiple compositional stages over two or three centuries,<sup>91</sup> we may not talk about the literary quotation/allusion by an author

---

<sup>87</sup> Karel van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible* (Cambridge, MA, and London: Harvard UP, 2009), 9.

<sup>88</sup> He notices “in the period of the Second Temple, however, the Bible was still a collection of scrolls—not a codex” and uses the “stream of tradition” instead of the term “books”. Ibid., 21, 26.

<sup>89</sup> Of course, some parts of book in dialogue influenced “by eastern Semites, and by the Sumerians,” may be as early as the second millennium B.C., ‘while the completed book may be as late as the third century B.C. Pope, *Job*, XXXVI–VII.

<sup>90</sup> Toorn concludes that “authors, in antiquity, were scribes.” van der Toorn, *Scribal*, 27–49.

<sup>91</sup> Gray argues that “the Book of Job, excluding the later addenda of the Elihu section (chs. 32-37), and the poems on Behemoth and Leviathan, and 42.12ff., which we regard as a midrashic expansion, was substantially composed between 450 and 350 BCE”. See Gray, *Job*, 35. See also Norman Henry Snaith, *The Book of Job: Its Origin and Purpose*, SBT 11 (London: SCM, 1968); Leo G. Perdue, *The Sword and the Stylus: An Introduction to Wisdom in the Age of Empires* (Grand Rapids, MI; Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans, 2008), 118–9.

living in a particular time and location, but it would probably be more appropriate to suppose that there were various voices in a group of authors through successive generations.

#### *1.2.1.2 Analogy*

Secondly, in order to show literary connection, it is necessary to present equivalent analogies, not loose linguistic correspondences. Does a cluster of parallel vocabularies and phrases between texts constitute definite analogies in both contexts? Generally, comparative study mainly concentrates on the use of the same phrases and motifs in parallel terms rather than on the entire contextual idea appearing in corresponding contexts, so that it readily overlooks the original purpose of the texts and obscures the genuine relationship between the texts. For instance, let us see the study of Tryggve Mettinger. Adopting the literary theory from Michael Riffaterre, he suggests the notion of literary devices such as ‘markers’ and ‘signals’ by which ‘the surface context’ triggers ‘a memory of the infracontext’.<sup>92</sup> The literary technique used in determining many textual meanings in relation to other texts, according to Mettinger, is ‘the metamorphic use of a traditional genre’; i.e., the author of Job is utilising many images and languages used in Psalms and Lamentations; e.g. the suffering man in Job 19:6-12 alludes to the siege metaphor in Lam 3.<sup>93</sup> What he indicates is not real analogies between passages in the context, but common literary motifs and genres such as lamentation, hymn, and law. Unfortunately, those similar genres/images between evoking and alluding texts are commonplace in the Hebrew Bible, and are not sufficient grounds to prove the literary connection.

---

<sup>92</sup> Tryggve N. D. Mettinger, “Intertextuality: Allusion and Vertical Context Systems in Some Job Passages,” in *Of Prophets’ Visions and the Wisdom of Sages : Essays in Honour of R. Norman Whybray on His Seventieth Birthday*, ed. Heather A. McKay and David J. A. Clines, JSOT (Sheffield: JSOT, 1993), 258–65.

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*, 275.

### 1.2.1.3 Dating Texts

Thirdly, the dating of biblical texts and their arrangement in a chronological order makes it difficult to establish literary dependence.

#### 1.2.1.3.1 Literary Dating

The dating used in claims about literary reference has mainly depended on linguistic features and patterns in Biblical Hebrew (BH). For example, Avi Hurvitz holds that much of the prose tale of Job has been written in late Biblical Hebrew (LBH) because of linguistic elements of post-exilic writing as shown in Esther, Chronicles and Ezra, and in the influence of Aramanism.<sup>94</sup> On the contrary, Ian Young insists in analysing Hurvitz's LBH linguistic elements that, although the prose tale includes LBH linguistic forms, it 'does not exhibit enough for an accumulation of LBH features to place it with the core LBH books', but rather it shows linguistic elements of early Biblical Hebrew (EBH).<sup>95</sup> More recently, Jan Joosten defends 'a mediating position', that the prose tale belongs to somewhere between LBH and EBH, and he assigns it to the Babylonian period rather than the Persian period.<sup>96</sup>

The debates with regard to linguistic dating of biblical materials are still on-going.<sup>97</sup> On the one hand, Hurvitz and his adherents maintain that LBH is distinct from EBH in its form and style and perfectly replaces EBH in chronology, so that with a profile of LBH linguistic elements, an unknown text can be dated by 'an accumulation of LBH features' (followed by Roland L.

---

<sup>94</sup> Avi Hurvitz, "Date of the Prose-Tale of Job Linguistically Reconsidered," *HTR* 67, no. 1 (1974): 17–34; for the similar dating, see Robert Gordis, *The Book of Job and Man: A Study of Job*, Phoenix ed. (Chicago; London: University of Chicago, 1978), 209–18; Hartley, *Job*, 17–20.

<sup>95</sup> He adds: "This conclusion has no chronological implication, however, since EBH and LBH represent not two chronological phases but co-existing styles of Hebrew in the post-exilic and quite possibly pre-exilic period." Ian Young, "Is the Prose Tale of Job in Late Biblical Hebrew?," *VT* 59, no. 4 (2009): 606.

<sup>96</sup> Jan Joosten, "Linguistic Clues as to the Date of the Book of Job: A Mediating Position," in *Interested Readers* (Atlanta: SBL, 2013), 347–57.

<sup>97</sup> Kim provides an interesting summary about two conflicting views on dating linguistic elements of biblical texts. See Dong-Hyuk Kim, *Early Biblical Hebrew, Late Biblical Hebrew, and Linguistic Variability: A Sociolinguistic Evaluation of the Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts*, SVT 156 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2013).

Bergey, Mark F. Roeker, Richard M. Wright).<sup>98</sup> On the other hand, Young, Robert Rezetko, and Martin Ehrensverd have challenged the methodology which Hurvitz and his followers have supported.<sup>99</sup> These opponents argue that LBH texts do not exclude EBH linguistic elements, but rather only that they contain more LBH linguistic elements than EBH elements, and that both EBH and LBH have always coexisted throughout the history of biblical literature.<sup>100</sup> What they assert is that it is not possible to date biblical texts as LBH texts, even though Hurvitz has exhibited a LBH linguistic profile. Lately, Dong-Hyuk Kim sought to judge between two conflicting views, and persuasively advocated Young's view from the sociolinguist's theory of William Labov who distinguishes two types of Hebrew linguistic changes;<sup>101</sup> though he partly agrees with Hurvitz's view that EBH and LBH need to be seen in chronological terms', he follows Young's view that it is certainly not possible to date biblical materials exclusively by linguistic styles and forms.

Both views have their own validity and there is certainly difficulty in giving a convincing solution in this sphere. In my opinion, as Hurvitz says, it would be reasonable to some degree to suppose that there are distinct forms and styles between two patterns of BH and that we might possibly put them in different historical periods. Nonetheless, I suppose that it is not necessary to regard the exilic period as a historical breaking point in dividing LBH from EBH completely.

---

<sup>98</sup> Ibid., 151–2. Avi Hurvitz, “Can Biblical Texts Be Dated Linguistically? Chronological Perspectives in the Historical Study of Biblical Hebrew,” in *Congress Volume: Oslo 1998*, ed. André Lemaire and Magne Sæbø, SVT 80 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2000), 143–60; *A Concise Lexicon of Late Biblical Hebrew: Linguistic Innovations in the Writings of the Second Temple Period*, SVT 160 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2014).

<sup>99</sup> Ian Young, Robert Rezetko, and Martin Ehrensverd, *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts* (London: Equinox, 2008). Also, see Ian Young, *Diversity in Pre-Exilic Hebrew*, *Forschungen zum Alten Testament* 5 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1993); “Biblical Texts Cannot Be Dated Linguistically,” *HS* 46 (2005): 341–51.

<sup>100</sup> Kim, *Early*, 152.

<sup>101</sup> Kim, *Early*, 89, 91. Kim says in concluding parts: “[M]ost linguistic changes discussed in historical and present-day sociolinguistics are changes from below. . . . Their language must have distinguished its users from those who did not use it and who belonged to the lower classes of the society”. Ibid., 157–8. Further, refer to William Labov, *Principles of Linguistic Change*, vol. 1, 2 vols., *Language in Society* 20 (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994).

In the main, I agree with Young and his followers, in claiming that differences between LBH and EBH need to be understood as the creative register of biblical authors, and the linguistic frequency in LBH and EBH texts could not be a factor in determining a chronological order; i.e., the diversity of BH seems to be ‘a matter of style, not chronology’.<sup>102</sup> So, if scholars wish to determine the chronological order in biblical texts from linguistic profiles, they need to consider that such a literary dating of BH necessarily involves many intricate problems.

#### 1.2.1.3.2 Dating of Job and Deutero-Isaiah

The dating of Job and Deutero-Isaiah for the discussion of comparative studies has been made in two ways: either by putting them in the same period or by putting them in different periods. Firstly, dating Job and Deutero-Isaiah at the same period has frequently been suggested. For instance, Leo Perdue dates the dialogues of Job (except for Job 1-2; 42:7-17; and Job 28, 32-37) and Deutero-Isaiah in the exilic period, as pointing out similar styles and themes; without assessment Perdue follows the dating of Deutero-Isaiah which Terrien already proposed.<sup>103</sup> He suggests as theological features of Job ‘the absence of major traditions of election, salvation history, covenant, and Torah’ and says that the author of Job reflects the Babylonian traditions during the Exile.<sup>104</sup> However, Perdue’s dating of the dialogues of Job and Deutero-Isaiah is highly problematic, in that we have no distinct linguistic profiles of exilic Biblical Hebrew.

Secondly, some argue that the two books came into existence in different periods. On the one hand, it has been claimed that Job is earlier than Deutero-Isaiah. For instance, Pfeiffer gives several linguistic features which indicate the priority of Job over Deutero-Isaiah; in the book of

---

<sup>102</sup> Young, Rezetko, and Ehrensverd, *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts*, 1:86.

<sup>103</sup> Of course, he agrees that “the folktale was told orally and then possibly written down during the First Temple period in order to present a story of edification” and Woman Wisdom in Job 28 and the Elihu speeches in Job 32-37 was formed in the Persian period. See Leo G. Perdue, *Wisdom Literature: A Theological History* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2007), 83–5.

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid.*, 85.



Job, he notices the use of the divine names אֱל and אֱלֹהִים, and the lack of technical terms (e.g., בָּרָא, יָצַר, פָּעַל) related to the theme of ‘creation’, which may be used in the post-exilic texts and which are found in texts of Deutero-Isaiah (Isa 41:4; 44:27; 45:12; 48:13f).<sup>105</sup> Similarly, Terrien’s claim, that Job was formed prior to Deutero-Isaiah, depends on literary-stylistic features which are prominent in the exilic and post-exilic periods; the author of Job does not use the Hebrew verb בָּרָא (‘to create’) in describing God’s creation activity and does not formulate the concept of ‘vicarious suffering’ found in Deutero-Isaiah;<sup>106</sup>

*Job could not have been inspired by Deutero-Isaiah without considering the solution of vicarious suffering. It is also very unlikely that he would speak of the creation without using the technical term, בָּרָא, ‘to create’, if he had known the work of Deutero-Isaiah.*<sup>107</sup>

Terrien, relying on the probable date of the formation of Deutero-Isaiah, estimates that the poet of Job may ‘be pictured as a man who lived probably between 580 and 540 BC’.<sup>108</sup> He dates the book of Job to the exilic period before Deutero-Isaiah, and suggests that Job should more likely be placed between old Babylonian Wisdom and Deutero-Isaiah; he dates the poetic dialogue (Job 3:1-42:6) to an early sixth century BCE in parallel references with Jeremiah (Job 3//Jer 20:14-18; Job 21//Jer 12:1-3) and the prologue and epilogue (Job 1-2; 42:7-17) to the ninth or eighth century BCE.<sup>109</sup> However, we have little reason to determine the priority of Job over Deutero-Isaiah solely on the basis that specific vocabularies and themes were frequently used or omitted, and recent commentators would not agree that the book of Job was formed in the pre-exilic and exilic periods.

---

<sup>105</sup> Pfeiffer, “Dual,” 205.

<sup>106</sup> Contra Gray, *Job*, 34; “We cannot admit the absence of the doctrine of atonement through vicarious suffering in the Book of Job as a reason for dating the Book before Deutero-Isaiah.”

<sup>107</sup> My own translation from Terrien, “Quelques,” 309–10.

<sup>108</sup> Terrien, “Job: Introduction,” 890; Terrien, “Quelques,” 300; “The problem of the dependence of Deutero-Isaiah to Job cannot be vitiated by the illusion that the book of Job was in manuscript in the sixth century BC.”

<sup>109</sup> Terrien, “Quelques,” 309–10; Terrien, *Job*, 14–5; “Job: Introduction,” 884–92.

On the other hand, recent scholarship has likely considered that Deutero-Isaiah was written in the exilic period (550-539 BCE) and the book of Job was formed later in the post-exilic period, so that it has been argued that Deutero-Isaiah influenced the book of Job (e.g., Sommer, Brinks, and Kynes); then, the primary source is not Job, but Deutero-Isaiah, and they do not consider the influence of Job on Deutero-Isaiah. Moreover, Janzen and Fishbane maintain that the book of Job employs the common theme of cosmic creation found in Gen 1, texts of Psalms (cf. Ps 89, 74), Jeremiah, and the Babylonian creation story, *Enuma elish*, so much so that the author of Job was aware of creation language which is mostly related to mythological figures; Fishbane in particular compares Job 3:1-13 and Gen 1-2:4a.<sup>110</sup> In this respect, Brinks argues that there is no evidence of any allusion of Deutero-Isaiah to Job, and that Job has been written subsequent to Deutero-Isaiah.<sup>111</sup> For another example, when Kynes assumes that the author of Job used texts of Deutero-Isaiah,<sup>112</sup> he uses other scholars' assumptions (Willey, Sommer, and Schultz) arguing that Deutero-Isaiah was earlier than the book of Job.

The priority of Deutero-Isaiah over Job might be most persuasive among recent interpreters, if we are required to take one from the above options. Nonetheless, such a dating of Job and Deutero-Isaiah would remain controversial, unless they provide clear linguistic and historical evidence. At best, from the debate, we may say that the final form of the book of Job has probably been established throughout the Persian period (538-332) since the pre-exilic period,

---

<sup>110</sup> Michael A. Fishbane, "Jeremiah IV 23-26 and Job III 3-13: A Recovered Use of the Creation Pattern," *JT* 21, no. 2 (1971): 151-67; Janzen, "Another"; Janzen, "Nature."

<sup>111</sup> Brinks, "Thematic," 178, 190; Kynes, "Job," 5.

<sup>112</sup> Kynes, "Job," 98. Also, Driver argues that the poet of Job parodies parts of Psalms (esp. Job 7:17//Ps 8) or Proverbs, as it is, under premises that if "Ps 8 implies familiarity with P, and P was written about 500 B.C., this alone brings down the book of Job as late as the 5th cent. B.C." See Driver, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Job*, lxvii-iii. Terrien rejects the possibility of determining the date of Job with uncertain dating of Psalms and Proverbs. See Terrien, "Job: Introduction," 889.

and that the dating of Deutero-Isaiah is not earlier than the exilic period; though we do not know the precise dates of the formation of the two books.<sup>113</sup>

### 1.2.2 The Misuse of Intertextuality

Comparative studies have tended to appropriate intertextual criticism as a more systematised method since the late twentieth century. In general, ‘intertextuality’ investigates the mass of unlimited networks and cross-influences that governs the composition, comprehension, and development of texts. This term, however, has been widely misused in biblical studies, so that this method has the same limitation as the general author-oriented approaches showed before the emergence of the intertextual study in the Old Testament.

#### 1.2.2.1 Theory of Intertextuality

The theory of ‘intertextuality’ first emerged from the idea of the Russian literary theorist M. M. Bakhtin and the terminology was introduced by Julia Kristeva in the late 1960s, in order to provide a literary tool for the process of textual transformation and in cultural interaction.<sup>114</sup> Although Kristeva invented this term, she was heavily influenced by the theories of Bakhtin.

---

<sup>113</sup> There are three ways for the dating of the book of Job: (1) the pre-exilic period, even the patriarch period; Pope, *Job*, xxxi–ii; Yehezkel Kaufmann, *The Religion of Israel: From Its Beginnings to the Babylonian Exile*, trans. Moshe Greenberg (London: Allen & Unwin, 1961), 334–8; Hartley, *Job*, 19; (2) the exilic period (587–538 BCE); Terrien, “Job: Introduction,” 884–92; Cheyne, *Job*, 74; (3) the Persian period; Naphtali H. Tur-Sinai, *The Book of Job: A New Commentary* (Jerusalem: Kiryath Sepher, 1967), XXX–LI; Gordis, *Man*, 207–18; Gray, *Job*, 32–5. For the dating of Deutero-Isaiah; (1) the pre-exilic period; Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah*, 3–6; (2) the exilic period; Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66*, 3–5; C. R. North, *The Second Isaiah: Introduction, Translation and Commentary to Chapters XL–LV* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964), 1–4; John L. McKenzie, *Second Isaiah*, AB 20 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1968), xxiv–xxx; Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 40–55*, 92–5; Shalom M. Paul, *Isaiah 40–66: Translation and Commentary*, The Eerdmans Critical Commentary (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2011), 2; (3) the Persian period; John Goldingay, *Isaiah 40–55: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, ed. David Payne, ICC 1 (London: T&T Clark, 2006), 25–30; Christopher R. Seitz, “Isaiah 40–66,” in *The New Interpreter’s Bible: General Articles & Introduction, Commentary, & Reflections for Each Book of the Bible, Including the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books in Twelve Volumes*, VI vols. (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1994), 316–9.

<sup>114</sup> Refer to Mary Orr, *Intertextuality Debates and Contexts* (Cambridge: Polity, 2003), 20–32; Graham Allen, *Intertextuality*, 2nd ed., The New Critical Idiom (London: Routledge, 2011), 8–60.

The core concept related to ‘intertextuality’ in Bakhtin’s work is found in the idea of ‘dialogism’ exemplified in novelistic prose and in other consequential terms such as ‘polyphony’, ‘heteroglossia’, ‘double-voiced discourse’, and ‘hybridization’.<sup>115</sup> To Bakhtin, the language ‘is shaped by dialogic interaction with an alien word that is already in the object’ and ‘a word forms a concept of its own object in a dialogic way’.<sup>116</sup> Bakhtin’s intertextuality is based on many complex social-cultural contexts in which utterances and words exemplify worldviews, interpretations, discourses, and ideologies in a ‘tension-filled environment’. He writes:

*The word, directed toward its object, enters a dialogically agitated and tension-filled environment of alien words, value judgments and accents, weaves in and out of complex interrelationship, merges with some, recoils from others, intersects with yet a third group: and all this may crucially shape discourse, may leave a trace in all its semantic layers, may complicate its expression and influence its entire stylistic profile. The living utterances, having taken meaning and shape at a particular historical moment in a socially specific environment, cannot fail to brush up against thousands of living dialogic threads, woven by socio-ideological consciousness around the given object of an utterance; it cannot fail to become an active participant in social dialogue. After all, the utterance arises out of this dialogue as a continuation of it and as a rejoinder to it—it does not approach the object from the sidelines.*<sup>117</sup>

Bakhtin claims that interrelationships in unlimited known and unknown texts, utterances, and discourses should be understood in *heteroglot* (‘as language’s ability to contain within it many voices, one’s own and other voices’)<sup>118</sup> which ‘represents the co-existence of socio-ideological contradictions between the present and the past, between differing epochs of the past, between different socio-ideological groups in the present, between tendencies, schools, circles and so forth, all given a bodily form’.<sup>119</sup> The dialogical nature of a literary work led him to criticise the idea of ‘stylistics’, literary critics ‘assuming that when readers read, communication proceeds in

---

<sup>115</sup> Allen, *Intertextuality*, 22.

<sup>116</sup> M. M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, ed. Michael Holquist, University of Texas Press Slavic Series 1 (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981), 279.

<sup>117</sup> *Ibid.*, 276–7.

<sup>118</sup> Allen, *Intertextuality*, 29.

<sup>119</sup> Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, 29.

a simple, direct, and uniform line from text to reader'.<sup>120</sup> This is the theoretical basis of language and text from Bakhtin used by Kristeva.

However, Kristeva does not repeat the notion of Bakhtin's dialogism, but by placing it into the term 'intertextuality', she extends the initial idea given by Bakhtin. As defined by Kristeva, 'an intertextuality' refers to no more than 'a permutation of texts' so that 'in the space of a given text, several utterances, taken from other texts, intersect and neutralize one another'.<sup>121</sup> Kristeva notices that texts are structuralized in different linguistic, social, and historical levels:

*The text is defined as a trans-linguistic apparatus that redistributes the order of language by relating communicative speech, which aims to inform directly, to different kinds of anterior or synchronic utterances. ... The concept of text as ideologeme determines the very procedure of a semiotics that, by studying the text as intertextuality, considers it as such within (the text of) society and history.*<sup>122</sup>

In particular, differently from Bakhtin, who sees 'a subject responding in a particular social world', Kristeva looks at language 'as a mosaic of interrelated, virtually subjectless discourses'.<sup>123</sup> Text is not isolated from social structure, so that it consists of a collection or combination of cultural, historical, and social texts which reflect all the different thoughts, words, and discourses. The consequence of this notion of intertextuality is to give up the traditional belief that texts have a unified and unique meaning, but to understand that 'texts are thoroughly connected to on-going cultural and social processes'.<sup>124</sup> Although Kristeva understands intertextuality in the frame of socio-cultural textuality, she recognises that her new term has been used in different ways in other places, and finds that it 'has often been understood in the banal sense of "study of sources"'.<sup>125</sup> In order to avoid the mistreatment of

---

<sup>120</sup> Patricia K. Tull, "Intertextuality and the Hebrew Scriptures," *CR: BS* 8 (2000): 68.

<sup>121</sup> Julia Kristeva, *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, ed. Leon Samuel Roudiez (Oxford: Blackwell, 1982), 36.

<sup>122</sup> See Chapter 2, "The Bounded Text"; *Ibid.*, 36–7.

<sup>123</sup> Tull, "Intertextuality," 71; also refer to Kristeva, *Desire*, 86–7.

<sup>124</sup> See Allen, *Intertextuality*, 37.

<sup>125</sup> Julia Kristeva, *Revolution in Poetic Language* (NY: Columbia UP, 1984), 60.

this term, she conveniently drops the term ‘intertextuality’ and uses another term ‘transposition’ (‘of one or several sign system(s) into another’), ‘because it specifies that the passage from one signifying system to another demands a new articulation of the thetic’.<sup>126</sup>

Following the theoretical heritage of Bakhtin and Kristeva, Roland Barthes announces ‘the death of the Author’ where ‘writing is that neutral, composite, oblique space where our subject slips away, the negative where all identity is lost, starting with the very identity of the body writing’.<sup>127</sup> The sense of intertextuality to Barthes goes far beyond any possible literary influence:

*We know now that a text is not a line of words releasing a single ‘theological’ meaning (the ‘message’ of the Author-God) but a multi-dimensional space in which a variety of writings, none of them original, blend and clash. The text is a tissue of quotations drawn from the innumerable centres of culture.*<sup>128</sup>

In this manner, what most postmodern linguistic theorists have argued is that all existent texts can and must be read in an unlimited network with other texts and that none of them can be interpreted as a separate document, but must be seen as a communicative dialogue in cultural textuality.<sup>129</sup> This is distinct from classic approaches of the originality, imitation, and intention in text, and it is significant to distinguish traditional claims about ‘influence theory’<sup>130</sup> from the postmodern concept of ‘intertextuality’.

---

<sup>126</sup> Ibid., 59–60.

<sup>127</sup> Roland Barthes, *Image, Music, Text*, trans. Stephen Heath, Fontana Communications Series (London: Fontana, 1977), 142.

<sup>128</sup> Ibid., 146.

<sup>129</sup> Allen states how “intertextuality” is used by people and comments on “how and why it has taken on its current meanings and applications”. Allen, *Intertextuality*, 2. Key texts on “intertextuality” include Ferdinand de Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics*, ed. Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye, trans. Roy Harris (London: Duckworth, 1983); Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*; Kristeva, *Desire*; Roland Barthes, “Theory of the Text,” in *Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader*, ed. Robert Young (Boston; London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981), 31–47.

<sup>130</sup> Worton and Still argue that “although the term intertextuality dates from the 1960s, the phenomenon, in some form, is at least as old as recorded human society.” Further they say that “imitation must therefore be seen as a theory not only of writing but also of reading as a performative act of criticism

### 1.2.2.2 *Intertextual Study in the Old Testament*

The present burgeoning of intertextual research in biblical studies has by and large benefited from the contemporary literary theorists, and biblical intertextual study has been discerned in two methodologies; ‘author-oriented’ and ‘reader-oriented’ intertextual studies. According to Patricia Tull, an author-oriented approach is labelled as that of ‘traditional’ intertextualists, and a reader-oriented approach is directed into that of ‘theoretical’ (or ‘radical’) ‘intertextualists’.<sup>131</sup> On the one hand, traditional intertextualists rely on ‘linear, historicist models of interpretation that seek to identify chronological relationships among texts’.<sup>132</sup> They explain the interrelationships, based on the concept of influence in which ‘the actions of later texts are described in relation to precursor texts, whether as “imitation”, “parody”, “misreading”, or “borrowing”’ (Bloom, Rabinowitz, Johnson).<sup>133</sup> On the other hand, theoretical intertextualists use a purely synchronic approach which is close to postmodern theory in which readers become a major subject of interpretation by imposing plural meanings. Tull says that they ‘view texts as being so thoroughly and deeply interwoven that tracing lines among them becomes as meaningless as distinguishing among water drops in the ocean’.<sup>134</sup> The idea of this group thus rejects the view of traditionalists and highlights ‘the multifaceted disalogical, revisionary, sometimes even polemical relationships in which texts stand over against one another’.<sup>135</sup>

Although there is a great gap between two methodologies, we do not have to resort exclusively to theoretical intertextuality as ignoring the author-centered approach, nor to apply the traditional approach (‘diachronic’) without noting a synchronic reading of a text.<sup>136</sup> To

---

and interpretation.” See Michael Worton and Judith Still, “Introduction,” in *Intertextuality: Theories and Practices* (Manchester; NY: Manchester UP, 1990), 2, 7.

<sup>131</sup> Tull, “Intertextuality,” 61–3.

<sup>132</sup> Geoffrey David Miller, “Intertextuality in Old Testament Research,” *CBR* 9, no. 3 (2011): 286.

<sup>133</sup> Tull, “Intertextuality,” 62.

<sup>134</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>135</sup> *Ibid.*, 62–3.

<sup>136</sup> Miller, “Intertextuality,” 286.

ameliorate this dichotomy between radical and traditional intertextuality, it would be laudable to combine the synchronic reading with the diachronic reading. For instance, Miller provides two examples as integrative approaches between a reader-oriented and a author-oriented reading; from the works of John Vassar who proposes multiple influences between texts, and of H. Koehl-Krebs who talks of a bi-directional influence.<sup>137</sup> However, Miller decisively dismisses this sort of integrative approach to equate two methods, saying that ‘it cannot withstand the criticism already voiced by many scholars, especially those adopting the reader-oriented approach.’<sup>138</sup> The point is that, whenever the integrated method is used, it leads to the same problem as the traditional intertextuality; by downgrading the meaning of ‘intertextuality’ into the level of prior ‘source-hunting’.<sup>139</sup>

When many biblical scholars introduce the concept of intertextuality into biblical hermeneutics, what they envisage differs from the original meaning. While many linguists commonly understand that ‘intertextuality’ refers to the way in which readers access unlimited sources, and that texts are shaped on the basis of cultural textuality,<sup>140</sup> it has more simply come to substitute the notion of literary reference between two texts. Ironically, this traditional notion of borrowing and influence is itself what the theorists who advocate the concept of ‘intertextuality’

---

<sup>137</sup> Ibid., 292–3. For these examples, see John S. Vassar, *Recalling a Story Once Told: An Intertextual Reading of the Psalter and the Pentateuch* (Macon, GA: Mercer UP, 2007), 35; H. Koehl-Krebs, “L’intertextualité Comme Méthode D’investigation Du Texte Biblique: L’exemple de Malachie 3,20,” *BN* 121 (2004): 63.

<sup>138</sup> Miller, “Intertextuality,” 292–3.

<sup>139</sup> “Intertextuality is one of the most commonly used and misused terms in contemporary critical vocabulary. ... Such a term is in danger of meaning nothing more than whatever each particular critic wishes it to mean,” Allen, *Intertextuality*, 2; Heinrich F. Plett, “Intertextualities,” in *Intertextuality* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1991), 3–29.

<sup>140</sup> However, I do not agree with the general argument of structuralism and post-structuralism which opens the plurality of textual meanings and which maintains that texts have no meanings and the authors of texts are no more than compilers of existent discourses. For the excellent criticism of this area, see Kevin J. Vanhoozer, *Is There a Meaning in This Text?: The Bible, the Reader, and the Morality of Literary Knowledge* (Leicester: Apollos, 1998).



have criticised.<sup>141</sup> For instance, since the publication of Michael Fishbane's influential book, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*,<sup>142</sup> frequently when biblical interpreters describe the relationship between an early source and a later borrower by using special terms such as 'exegesis', 'influence', 'revision', 'polemic', 'allusion', or 'echo', they have blended the approach of literary influence with the notion of 'intertextuality'.<sup>143</sup> Such a literary technique to some degree might come from the Jewish-Christian interpretive premise. Fishbane describes intra-biblical interpretation,<sup>144</sup> using a *traditum-traditio* model and categorising the historical process of scribal edition into the three genres, 'law, *aggadah*, and mantology'.<sup>145</sup> In another place, while distinguishing diverse modes of canon according to 'successive stages of culture'—the 'proto-canonical stage' ('the canon-before-the-canon'), the 'canon-within-the-canon stage', and the canonical final corpus which is related to 'the archetypal mode of exegetical work in rabbinic Judaism'—Fishbane suggests:

*Indeed, the principle of "damileih" (or resemblance) is the deep principle of analogy that underpins all rabbinic midrash, in one form or another, creating out of Scripture a vast warp and woof of intertextual connections. ... For the rabbinic mind, then, Scripture is intertextual to the core. Indeed, for the ancient sages the canon and intertextuality are functional corollaries—the one being the fixed context, the other the ever possible praxis. Rabbinic exegesis stands on this basic point.*<sup>146</sup>

The idea of Fishbane's biblical intertextuality has been influential in establishing the tradition of rabbinic Midrash and in some degree it is quite true that in Jewish-Christian canonical

---

<sup>141</sup> Marko Juvan, "Towards a History of Intertextuality in Literary and Culture Studies," *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 10, no. 3 (2008): 3.

Patricia K. Tull, "Intertextuality and the Hebrew Scriptures," *CR: BS* 8 (2000): 61–3.

<sup>142</sup> Michael A. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985); note also his earlier *Text and Texture: Close Readings of Selected Biblical Texts* (NY: Schocken Books, 1979).

<sup>143</sup> See, e.g., Sommer, *Prophet*.

<sup>144</sup> The term "inner-biblical" has been synonymous with "intra-biblical" (DBCI, 167–9).

<sup>145</sup> Fishbane, *Biblical*, 88.

<sup>146</sup> Michael A. Fishbane, "Types of Biblical Intertextuality," in *Congress Volume: Oslo 1998*, SVT 80 (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 44.

exegesis, pointing to other scriptural texts is helpful in enlightening the textual correlation; it is far from my intention to put forward that the entire claim of Fishbane and other interpreters adopting the concept of intra-biblical exegesis is erroneous.<sup>147</sup> However, when considering the original sense of what Kristeva and his adherents said, such a statement, ‘intertextuality is the core of the canonical imagination’,<sup>148</sup> needs to be reconsidered.

With regard to this issue, David Carr, in his recent work, criticises the concept of biblical intertextuality as a literary technique which attempts to redirect the literary resources behind given texts, and he argues that intertextuality is actually a complex, uncontrollable, and unconscious network.<sup>149</sup> The necessity to distinguish ‘influence’ from ‘intertextuality’ has been clearly argued by Carr:

*Insofar as biblical scholars aim and claim to be reconstructing specific relationships between a given biblical text and earlier texts, the proper term for this type of inquiry is reconstruction of “influence,” not “intertextuality.” The term “intertextuality” in contrast is proper to the myriad of largely unreconstructable, conscious and unconscious relationships between a given text, say a biblical text in this case, and a variety of sorts of “texts”—oral discourse, business interactions, artistic creation, etc.—in circulation in a broader culture. Insofar as this broader realm of intertexts is relatively inaccessible to biblical scholars, “intertextuality” thus is best used to refer to the “unknown” background of biblical texts.<sup>150</sup>*

Carr then suggests that the concept of literary influence used in reconstructing literary relationship only within canonical corpus should be substituted for the theory of intertextuality

---

<sup>147</sup> Carr indicates the same point: “I think Fishbane is largely right about the norms surrounding much Jewish and Christian interpretation of scripture, and I am not criticizing Fishbane or anyone else here for failing to be true to the original intention behind Kristeva’s and others’ use of the term “intertextuality”. See David M. Carr, “The Many Uses of Intertextuality,” in *Congress Volume Helsinki 2010*, ed. Martti Nissinen, SVT 148 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2012), 515.

<sup>148</sup> Fishbane, “Types of Biblical Intertextuality,” 39.

<sup>149</sup> Carr, “Many,” 515–7.

<sup>150</sup> *Ibid.*, 522–3.

in which texts include ‘not just literary works, but (also) all kinds of popular culture, oral discourse, concepts, motifs, etc’.<sup>151</sup> Carr notes:

*Authors of any time or age always had to work with chunks of language and language patterns that had, whether they knew it or not, been previously used in earlier textual combinations, which in turn were dependent on earlier, quite different combinations in an infinite and amorphous semiotic network.*<sup>152</sup>

Therefore, if ‘intertextuality’ is understood as an intricate and unlimited network in which any literature reflects dialogues with other earlier and contemporary materials, but also as cultural diversity found in oral speech, known/unknown texts or motifs, and conscious/unconscious texts, the original meaning of ‘intertextuality’ probably is much closer to a reader-oriented approach than an author-oriented approach. Miller puts it in this way:

*Since the reader-oriented, purely synchronic approach constitutes a more authentic application of the post-structuralist concept borrowed from literary theory and postmodern thought, it should be designated as the study of intertextuality. The more diachronic, author-oriented approach indebted to traditional methods of biblical criticism should be given a different name, as many scholars have tried to do.*<sup>153</sup>

Likewise, Benjamin Sommer obviously distinguishes intertextuality from influence and allusion, and selects as methodology the principle of literary allusion and influence concerning the study of the literary relationship of Isaiah 40-66 in the Hebrew Bible;

*Intertextuality is synchronic in its approach, influence or allusion diachronic or even historicist. Intertextuality is interested in a very wide range of correspondences among texts, influence and allusion with a more narrow set. Intertextuality examines the relations among many texts, while influence and allusion look for specific connections between a limited number of texts.*<sup>154</sup>

Therefore, let us maintain the concept of ‘intertextuality’ in biblical study, if interpreters use this term in a reader-oriented approach based on a postmodern theory. Otherwise, it would be

---

<sup>151</sup> See *ibid.*, 516.

<sup>152</sup> *Ibid.*, 511.

<sup>153</sup> Miller, “Intertextuality,” 305.

<sup>154</sup> Sommer, *Prophet*, 8.

more precise to use the term ‘inner-biblical exegeses’, ‘inner-biblical allusion’, or ‘inner-biblical echo’<sup>155</sup> than to adopt the intertextual criticism or the integrated method under a covering-term of ‘intertextuality’.

### 1.2.2.3 *Intertextual Study in Job and Deutero-Isaiah*

When recent scholars introduce the theory of intertextuality, they mostly speak of the literary dependence/influence by terms of ‘echo’, ‘allusion’, or ‘quotation’ according to the degree of the authorial consciousness, rather than substantiating the meaning of intertextuality; e.g., Nurmela explains intertextual links as quotation and allusion; Pyeon as allusion and echo, Brinks and Kynes as allusion.<sup>156</sup> Let us look at the works of Brinks and Kynes among the latest studies.<sup>157</sup>

Firstly, Brinks criticises most of the previous interpreters, saying that former surveys, which predate theoretical development of intertextuality, did not pay sufficient attention ‘to the complex composition history of the two works’.<sup>158</sup> She argues that interpreters did not consider

---

<sup>155</sup> Miller, “Intertextuality,” 305; Miller provides some references to use “inner-biblical” exegesis or allusion; Fishbane, *Biblical*; Karl William Weyde, “Inner-Biblical Interpretation: Methodological Reflections on the Relationship between Texts in the Hebrew Bible,” *SEÅ* 70 (2005): 287–300. Lyle M. Eslinger, “Inner-Biblical Exegesis and Inner-Biblical Allusion: The Question of Category,” *VT* 42, no. 1 (1992): 47–58; Benjamin D. Sommer, “Exegesis, Allusion and Intertextuality in the Hebrew Bible: A Response to Lyle Eslinger,” *VT* 46, no. 4 (1996): 479–89; J. M. Leonard, “Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusions: Psalm 78 as a Test Case,” *JBL* 127 (2008): 241–65.

<sup>156</sup> See Nurmela, *Mouth* “Introduction”; Yohan Pyeon, *You Have Not Spoken What Is Right About Me: Intertextuality and the Book of Job* (NY: Peter Lang, 2003), 68; Brinks, “Thematic,” 101–2; Kynes, “Job,” 98.

<sup>157</sup> Among four researches which appropriate the theory of intertextuality between Job and Deutero-Isaiah, the methods of Pyeon and Nurmela are not entirely sophisticated and well-established. The intertextual study of Pyeon is in fact a diachronic approach which puts Job’s intertexts in earlier sources without looking at various intertextual relationships between Job 3–14 and the Hebrew Bible. Nurmela assumes the direction of dependence only by verbal parallels between Isaiah 40–55 and Job without presenting supportive clues.

<sup>158</sup> Brinks, “Thematic,” 67.

‘the more subtle rhetorical strategies of allusion, echo’,<sup>159</sup> and defines ‘intertextuality’ as ‘containing within it all manner of connections between all manner of texts’.<sup>160</sup> She states that ‘any conclusions about authorial intention have to remain tentative’, but immediately changes her stance:

*[L]anguage of intentionality is unavoidable in the present case. I am interested in whether and how the ancient and anonymous author(s) in question used the words of a previous text to communicate something to readers and what impact that rhetorical strategy might have on the interpretation of the author’s text.*<sup>161</sup>

She simply chooses the concepts of quotation and allusion that include the intentionality of authors as a working hypothesis, but does not consider the notion of intertextuality important enough.<sup>162</sup> Then, she concludes that the author of Job was associating with passages of Deutero-Isaiah (Job 9:2-12; 12:7-25; Isa 40:26; 44:24; 41:20) and ‘may have borrowed wording from the third and fourth servant poems for Job’s self-description’. In general, it would be reasonable to talk about literary techniques of ‘quotation’ and ‘allusion’ in the Hebrew Bible, but her methodology fails to make a difference with previous scholars whom she earlier criticised. Further, if she seeks to argue the literary relationship as a parody of Job on Deutero-Isaiah, it is necessary to provide more evidence beyond verbal affinities.

Secondly, Kynes proposes ‘intertextualities in dialogue’ between Job and Deutero-Isaiah.<sup>163</sup> In methodology presented in the study between Job and Psalms, he maintains that the separation between the progressive understanding and the traditional understanding of intertextuality is a ‘false dichotomy’, saying that the criticism against traditionalists is ‘subjective and

---

<sup>159</sup> Ibid.

<sup>160</sup> Ibid., 100.

<sup>161</sup> Ibid., 101.

<sup>162</sup> She says: “Still, the goal is an important one; if an author’s textual conversation partners can be discovered, it follows that doing so gives the audience an advantage in interpreting his or her words. The value of this goal is illustrated by the proliferation of investigations into the sources of quotation and allusion, especially in English poetry.” See *ibid.*, 70–1.

<sup>163</sup> Kynes, “Job.”

exaggerated'.<sup>164</sup> He applies the notion of dialogical intertextuality to the relationship between Job and Deutero-Isaiah. In spite of the careful examination, he simply dismisses the possibility of the priority of Job over Deutero-Isaiah posed by Terrien, saying; 'instead of answering Job's question, allusions to Job's speeches would undercut the message of Isa 40-55 altogether.'<sup>165</sup> As an explanation for 'the antithetical relationship between the respective meanings of the parallel in their context', he argues that there was 'parody';<sup>166</sup> what the 'parody' implies necessarily presumes the intentional usage by the later author to produce a new context from the source text. The attempt to satisfy both camps of synchronic and diachronic approaches deserves encouragement, but Kynes' method of drawing the priority of one text over another is far from the original sense of 'intertextuality' which involves cultural knowledge; these diachronic approaches on the basis of the chronological order and the authorial intentionality would not enrich biblical 'intertextuality'.

### *1.3 Conclusion*

So far, I have summarised the diverse scholarly claims for relationships between Job and Deutero-Isaiah according to their resemblances and interpretations. What biblical scholars have consistently assumed is that the similarities between the two books in vocabularies, forms, and themes appear as significant indicators of the literary dependence or reference by author(s); though a few interpreters argue the influence of common sources in Israelite or non-Israelite literature and tradition.<sup>167</sup> Then, I have analysed several limits of the aforementioned researches

---

<sup>164</sup> Will Kynes, "My Psalm Has Turned into Weeping: The Dialogical Intertextuality of Allusions to the Psalms in Job" (PhD, Cambridge: University of Cambridge, 2011), 22–5. He argues: "I have developed an approach for identifying inner-biblical allusions and interpreting them both historically and hermeneutically and labeled it 'intertextualities in dialogue' to express my belief that the interpretation of allusions best lies in the interface between diachronic and synchronic approaches"; Ibid., 30.

<sup>165</sup> Kynes, "Job," 98.

<sup>166</sup> Ibid.

<sup>167</sup> The use of common sources and themes will be examined in Chapter 2 and literary connections with non-Israelite sources will be treated in Chapter 5.

between the texts of Job and Deutero-Isaiah, although they have helped our understanding of interrelationships between the two books. Firstly, among scholarly claims before and after the development of intertextual criticism, an author-oriented approach has evinced the lack of historical evidence in terms of the authorial intention and the question of literary influence. The theory of literary dependence/influence needs to clarify some muddy issues about the nature of ancient texts, analogy, and literary dating, if one tries to apply it to the comparative study between the two books. Secondly, when applying the modern theory of intertextuality into comparative studies, scholars have more or less misused the original meaning of ‘intertextuality’ that means social and cultural textuality, and have very often replaced it with literary reference. In fact, the process of the oral-literary transmission of biblical writings makes it difficult to prove that there was a literary dependence in the pre-canonical stage. Of course, the well-balanced ‘intra-biblical exegesis’ limiting its boundary within the canonical corpus is welcome and always is commendable, but it is important to distinguish intertextual study from intra-biblical exegesis. Literary reference from one text to the other thus should be taken in a cautious way,<sup>168</sup> and biblical intertextuality needs to be applied within more accurate guidelines.<sup>169</sup>

If the former ways to explain resemblances cannot be appropriate, we now need to go one step further and I here propose another way of understanding the literary relationship between Job and Deutero-Isaiah. If it is hard to insist that there are referential connections between the two books, what is the most probable scenario which we can consider? How can we explain the literary resemblance between the two books? Although there are numerous resemblances

---

<sup>168</sup> Juvan notes: “Masterful borrowing was until the eighteenth century acknowledged as the normal path to artistry. ... Influence was, as a matter of fact, accepted in literary historical terminology only from the second half of the nineteenth century on. Positivists and their descendants believed that aside from past literary words there were many other powerful impulses for artistic creativity”. Juvan, “Towards,” 2.

<sup>169</sup> Plett notices that “intertextuality is not a time-bound feature in literature and the arts.” see Plett, “Intertextualities,” 26.

leading us to believe that there might be one-sided or mutual influence or the use of a specific common source, it would be more likely that the two literary works were developed in a common writing culture in the Israelite community and that those resemblances were produced by the shared socio-historical background. Until now, not many scholars seem to question the concept of the literary influence with regard to the historical background for those resemblances, but throughout this research, I will suggest that Job and Deutero-Isaiah are products of the shared cultural heritage of literate experts.



## Chapter 2 Resemblances between Job and Deutero-Isaiah

In this chapter, I will explore whether common themes and expressions between Job and Deutero-Isaiah may be accepted as reasonable evidence of a distinctive relationship, and for this purpose, I will examine the probable links between the two books and see if they do pass several tests. I here ask three questions: (1) Is the supposed commonality such as ‘theodicy’, ‘suffering servant’, ‘creation’ and ‘monotheism’ being used as umbrella terms too vague? (2) Are supposed parallels actually using the same elements in a different context with a different meaning? (3) When observing possible textual links, are the suggested resemblances prevalent in other ancient Near Eastern literature or unique to the Hebrew Bible? Finally, I will scrutinise five remarkable expressions among many parallels which exegetes have mostly identified. By this, we will see that though they are similar in themes and expressions, when they appear in corresponding books they are being used to convey different ideas and thoughts. If what the texts have in common is only the wording and the general subject-matters, that is insufficient to support the idea that there was direct borrowing or contact.

### 2.1 *Examining Common Themes and Terms*

#### 2.1.1 Theodicy and Suffering Servant

‘Theodicy’ normally means ‘discourse about the justice of God in the face of indications to the contrary—the presence in the world of evil in all its forms.’<sup>170</sup> The issue of theodicy, the so-called religious and philosophical attempt to answer the questions in terms of evil and suffering in the world, is likely to commonly appear in both books as the most central theme. A group of scholars has seen general resemblances in the thought of unresolved problems of suffering and has explored it as an indispensable source of inspiration. From that standpoint, they have

---

<sup>170</sup> John A. Davies, “Theodicy,” in *DOTWPW* (IVP, 2008), 808.

recognised commonalities between the figure of the suffering servant in Deutero-Isaiah and the model of the innocent sufferer in Job.

#### 2.1.1.1 *Theodicy*

I suggest three ways in which ‘theodicy’ may not be a proper term to understand biblical ideas as well as texts of Job and Deutero-Isaiah. Firstly, the term ‘theodicy’ is too vague a concept to apply to the association between biblical texts—the same can be said of non-Israelite texts—and it is likely to be the product of cultural and theoretical understanding, developed in contemporary modern thought. This term was coined by modern philosophers in the attempt to explain the theological dilemma of incompatibility between the existence of evil and the good and omnipotent God. For instance, Marcel Sarot notes that the Greek compound term—‘God’ (Θεός) and ‘justice’ (δίκη)—was first used by Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz in 1710 and has been popular in the West since the eighteenth century.<sup>171</sup>

In fact, the issue of divine injustice has not been debated anywhere in ancient Near Eastern literature in the same manner as the modern philosophical concept of ‘theodicy’. The ancient Near Eastern documents neither attempt to defend divine justice before undeserved suffering of humanity nor to describe sufferers as innocent;<sup>172</sup> it is difficult to see any intention by authors to defend injustice of divine action from which arises human suffering and natural disaster. And they neither discuss in the purely theoretical and abstract dimension the problem of justice and

---

<sup>171</sup> He proposes three meanings of theodicy in modern thinking which are not homogenous with the ancient Jewish concept: “the philosophical study of the relation of God and evil”, “the defence of the justice of God in spite of the evils in God’s creation”, and “rational theology”. Marcel Sarot, “Theodicy and Modernity,” in *Theodicy in the World of the Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 2–4. Thus, it is not proper to employ this culturally-influenced complex term in the biblical study of pre-modern times and the idea of “theodicy” should be excluded in interpreting given biblical materials. Ibid., 5–26.

<sup>172</sup> Bricker in two articles examines the validity of categorizing some of Mesopotamian and Egyptian works into the term of “theodicy” and argues that to entitle those ancients as “theodicy” is anachronistic; it comes from a modern sense because the divine justice in ancient texts is hardly doubted. See Daniel P. Bricker, “Innocent Suffering in Mesopotamia,” *TB* 51, no. 2 (2000): 193–214; “Innocent Suffering in Egypt,” *TB* 52, no. 1 (2001): 83–100.

evil, nor pursue the ideal and rational solution to it. Then, how does the Hebrew Bible tackle the issue of suffering and evil? The Hebrew Bible talks about the realistic pain of an individual and the national tragedy occurring in Israelite's history. There may be places in the Hebrew Bible which describe issues of good and evil which have some affinity with the idea of modern theodicy.<sup>173</sup> However, most theological aspects of evil and injustice from biblical materials are far from the thought of modern theodicy, although interpreters think that biblical texts discuss the philosophical origin of evil to defend the divine justice against the atheistic position of non-Israelites. It consequently may be risky to suggest 'theodicy' as the distinctive motif in the Hebrew Bible.

Secondly, the usage of the term 'theodicy' should be avoided, in that biblical texts have their own contexts, although they broadly speak of the problem of human suffering. It is evident that the primary concern of Job in the dialogue is justice itself, whether it is related to the social justice in the world or to the individual experience. However, it is linked neither to defensive thinking concerning the origin of evil in the ethical world, nor to the divine provision in an evil world. What Job keeps on pursuing in the dialogue is his public vindication by God in relation to his innocent suffering, while Job at this point realises that the place where he lives is not the morally ideal world; and he puts forward questions about distorted justice. Moreover, the poetic dialogue in Job is not based on the philosophical theory of theodicy, but on a practical and authentic reflection involving the innermost despair and pain in his life. Yahweh's speech, also, supplies no answer with regard to the abstract tension between justice and evil. E. W.

Nicholson notices that 'understood in this way, such a declaration self-evidently considers theodicy unnecessary, since one of the main purposes of theodicy is to acquit God of the evil

---

<sup>173</sup> Sarot mentions a few biblical perspectives which indicate the modern view of theodicy. See Sarot, "Theodicy," 22–5. In the same book, Latta and Moor categorise six typological aspects of theodicy from the monotheistic Jewish-Christian context. See Antti Laato and Johannes Cornelis de Moor, "Introduction," in *Theodicy in the World of the Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), vii – liv.

that may befall the righteous.<sup>174</sup> Likewise, David Burrell comments: ‘it seems quite clear now that the poet has little to offer for one who defines theodicy as “explaining how there could be evil in God’s world.”’<sup>175</sup> Likewise, Deutero-Isaiah has no intention of defending or of rationalising God’s justice, nor of explaining it in relation to evil in the world in the light of philosophical theory; but instead, the prophet declares the righteous judgment of God, and confirms who is the true God in sharp contrast to idols and idol-makers. He speaks of the way in which iniquities committed by Israelites, and their distress, vanish in accordance with God’s purpose; and he describes how God controls political and cosmic evil. Thus, the idea of ‘theodicy’ could not be applied in interpreting the biblical texts like the book of Job which treats an individual’s suffering in the consistent faith of Yahweh or like Deutero-Isaiah in which God directly responds to the problem of evil and to the practical issue of the community. Lastly, the theme of ‘human suffering’<sup>176</sup> is too widespread in extra-biblical materials to be a distinctive theme in Job and Deutero-Isaiah.<sup>177</sup> Scholars have acknowledged that the two books

---

<sup>174</sup> See Ernest W. Nicholson, “The Limits of Theodicy as a Theme of the Book of Job,” in *Wisdom in Ancient Israel* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge UP, 1995), 78.

<sup>175</sup> See David B. Burrell and Anthony H. Johns, *Deconstructing Theodicy: Why Job Has Nothing to Say to the Puzzle of Suffering* (Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2008), 123. Illman notices that it is difficult “to say how theodicy in the Book of Job fits into Green’s classification” of theodicy (“the free-will-theodicy”, “the educative theodicy”, “the eschatological theodicy”, “theodicy deferred”, and “the communion theodicies”). See Karl-Johan Illman, “Theodicy in Job,” in *Theodicy in the World of the Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 304.

<sup>176</sup> I have already started this section by saying that ‘theodicy’ was never dealt with in ancient Near Eastern texts. Although some have perceived that there are problems in using the term ‘theodicy’—mostly people did not pay attention to this—this has been designated as a category in ancient literature. In this thesis, I will sometimes follow this convention for convenience sake, when the ancient Near Eastern texts are related to issues of human suffering, disasters, and innocent sufferer.

<sup>177</sup> See Karel van der Toorn, “Theodicy in Akkadian Literature,” in *Theodicy in the World of the Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 57–89; Antonio Loprieno, “Theodicy in Ancient Egyptian Texts,” in *Theodicy in the World of the Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 27–56. Crenshaw provides the broad context and text of “theodicy” in the Old Testament. See Crenshaw, “Popular”; “The Shift from Theodicy to Anthropodicy,” in *Theodicy in the Old Testament*, ed. James L. Crenshaw, IRT 4 (Philadelphia: London: Fortress; SPCK, 1983), 1–16; “Theodicy and Prophetic Literature,” in *Theodicy in the World of the Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 236–55; James L. Crenshaw, *Defending God: Biblical Responses to the Problem of Evil* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2005).

display literary resemblances to Egyptian and Akkadian literature. In particular, it has been thought that the book of Job, which is struggling with the mysterious knowledge of God allowing undeserved suffering, is the representative book among Israelite writings alongside ancient works related to the innocent sufferer. For example, we have famous Babylonian and Egyptian documents that may be classified as ‘theodicy’ literature such as the *The Babylonian Theodicy* and *The Dialogue of a Man with His Soul*.<sup>178</sup> Further, in order to connect Israelite texts with the notion of ‘theodicy’, scholars mainly select argumentative discourses in the texts and present the form of lawsuits or judicial proceedings; for instance, James Crenshaw and Gunnel André argue that Job and Deutero-Isaiah adopt the form of the legal and controversial debate.<sup>179</sup> However, in a nutshell, the specific form of lawsuit does not necessarily represent the idea of theodicy and no context in each book is equivalent to a real lawsuit type and judicial procedure. In Job, technical terms (rīb-pattern, expressions related to ‘judgment’, etc) employed by Job articulate a wish for God’s vindication, whereas the polemic language in Deutero-Isaiah is designed as a broadside against the powerless idols and foreign gods.

#### 2.1.1.2 *Suffering Servant*

It has been argued that the suffering of the innocent individual that the story of Job pinpoints is associated with the mysterious suffering of Yahweh’s servant in Isaiah 52:13-53:12.<sup>180</sup> Such a thematic affinity normally has made readers perceive the character of Job as an equivalent metaphor to the servant of Yahweh who suffered from severe distresses. However, these links neither mean that the motif of the suffering individual is identical in both texts, nor do they demonstrate the distinctive relationship between them. This motif of the suffering servant is, to some extent, overstated and is not dependent on precise analogy. If we closely observe the

---

<sup>178</sup> Cf., see Chapter 5 of this thesis.

<sup>179</sup> Terrien, “Quelques,” 304; Crenshaw, “Popular,” 388–9; André, “Deuterojesaja,” 35, 39–42.

<sup>180</sup> Cheyne, *Prophecies*, 2:259–68; Terrien, “Quelques,” 308; Elliott, “Comparative,” 273–5; Hartley, *Job*, 14–5; Curtis, “Elihu,” 10:35–6; Bastiaens, “Suffering”; Cooper, “Suffering”; Brinks, “Thematic,” 145–8, 179–88.

origin and nature of the sufferings of Job and the Servant, it will be seen that the suffering servant's description in Deutero-Isaiah is incompatible with the figure of Job and that the nature of the suffering which two characters confront is likely to be quite different at several points.

On the one hand, in the book of Job, the purpose of innocent suffering and its explanations are not answered anywhere. In the prologue, Job's unfortunate course has been drawn by the divine allowance of sufferings to attest the piety of Job challenged by 'the Satan',<sup>181</sup> and questions of the individual's suffering and social injustice continue in the dialogue, instantly coming to an end with the unexpected divine teaching of the cosmic design. No part of Yahweh's speech is linked to the issue of human injustice, although it might be given to individuals for the sake of the divine discipline which Job and Elihu state (Job 23:10; 33:2-37; 36:5-15; cf. Isa 48:10), and in the epilogue, we may not decisively find the sensible purpose of Job's afflictions. On the other hand, the poem of Yahweh's servant in Deutero-Isaiah seems to have apparent purposes for others' benefits. His suffering has the representative, vicarious, and substitute characteristics 'instead of' and 'for' others' sin and weakness (Isa 53:4-6). Although the substitutionary sacrifice of the suffering servant, which is not bound to the sacrificial law system in Leviticus, is unlawful and unjust, Yahweh ultimately will make his soul a sin offering (זֶשֶׁן) (Isa 53:10) by removing others' penalties and withdrawing the divine punishment. Likewise, Job, in a sense, could be portrayed as a priest to be concerned with others' sins, but rather what Job does

---

<sup>181</sup> The noun הַשָּׂטָן ('the Satan') with the definite article in Hebrew only occurs fourteen times in the prologue of Job (1:6, 7 (x 2), 8, 9, 12 (x 2); 2:1, 2 (x 2), 3, 4, 6, 7) and three times in Zechariah 3:1-2. Otherwise, in 1 Chr 21:1 and Num 22:22, the noun 'Satan' without the definite article becomes a proper name. The development of the conception of הַשָּׂטָן as a personal name 'Satan' seems to come from the later Jewish and non-Jewish tradition (Clines, 20; Gray, 126; Gordis, 14), so that this term in Job should be distinguished from 'Satan' of the later modification. Some render הַשָּׂטָן in Job as 'the Adversary' (Seow, 272) or 'the Prosecutor' (Good, 50) as a title who functions as the opponent of humans and of God. However, in the narrative of Job, הַשָּׂטָן is not the antagonist of God, but is subordinate to Yahweh and functions as the adversary of humans like Job (Clines, 19-20; Gray, 126). I render this as 'the Satan'.

at most is to present burnt offerings (עֹלֹת) for his children's probable sin, considering that they might 'curse God in their hearts' (Job 1:5) and for his friends as an intercessory work according to God's command (Job 42:8-9). Furthermore, while Job actively protests his innocence from the beginning, Deutero-Isaiah accentuates the silence of Yahweh's servant in his voluntary act, conforming to his inevitable fate as a victim (Isa 53:7). So, Job's works would be little identical with the substitutionary sacrifice of the Yahweh's servant of Deutero-Isaiah.

In addition, when seeing the relationship between the two books on the model of suffering servant, some have perceived Job not as an individual, but a collective whole. Such a view metaphorically blends the figures of Job and Yahweh's servant with the national identity of Israel during the exile. T. K. Cheyne, for instance, broadly regards Job as the representative of all humanity which suffers earthly hardships (Job 9:25; 6:2, 3; 7:1-3; 14:1, 2);<sup>182</sup> Alan Cooper also claims that the figure of Job to be identified with Yahweh's servant should be regarded as the symbol of the exiled Israelite community.<sup>183</sup> However, a major problem with this view is that Job's suffering could not be generalised at the level of human suffering usually observed, because Job's case is unusual and improbable in reality. Nothing in the book of Job possibly indicates that Job represents the Israelite community; its story takes place in non-Israelite territory, 'in the land of Uz' (Job 1:1a) and it does not have clear references of Israel's history. Moreover, it is hard to determine whether Yahweh's servant in the servant poems of Deutero-Isaiah (Isa 42:1-9; 49:1-7; 50:4-11; 52:13-53:12) is used either as the symbol of Jacob-Israel (Isa 43-48), as an unknown individual, as a historical individual or as the prophet himself.<sup>184</sup> Of course, in many ways, it would be reasonable to believe that Yahweh's servant in Deutero-Isaiah may symbolise the entire Israelite community. However, especially in Isa 52:13-53:12,

---

<sup>182</sup> Cheyne, *Prophecies*, 2:261, 264.

<sup>183</sup> Cooper, "Suffering."

<sup>184</sup> C. R. North, *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah: An Historical and Critical Study*, 2nd ed. (London: Oxford UP, 1956).

the mixture of pronouns ‘I’, ‘he’, ‘we’ and ‘they’ makes it confusing to distinguish the identity of Yahweh’s servant.<sup>185</sup> The initial cause of the Israelites’ suffering was divine punishment for their own iniquities, and this differs from the reason why Yahweh’s innocent servant in Deutero-Isaiah undergoes sufferings. So, the argument that the identity of the suffering servant in Isa 52:13-53:12 refers to Jacob-Israel is rather unconvincing.

### 2.1.2 Creation and Monotheism

Both Job and Deutero-Isaiah share considerable interests in Yahweh as a Creator God and as a supreme God among all deities. This context of God’s singleness has been generally presented in the typical themes of ‘creation’ and ‘monotheism’.

#### 2.1.2.1 Creation

The theme of ‘creation’ seems variously to be related to the beginning of the world and human beings as the primeval event, to the establishment of the cosmic, social, and moral order, and to its continuous sustaining power. Many interpreters consider that the creation of the world in connection with Gen 1-11 is shown in the prologue, in the hymns of the poetic dialogue debating the divine justice (Job 9:8-10; 12:7-25; 26:7-10), in the Hymn of Wisdom (28:1-28), in Elihu’s speech (36:26-37:24), and in Yahweh’s speech (38-41).<sup>186</sup> This strong drift toward the subject-matter of creation is because interpreters categorically have assumed that a creation doctrine occupies the central position in wisdom literature. Such as, creation theology has been

---

<sup>185</sup> David J. A. Clines, *I, He, We and They: A Literary Approach to Isaiah 53* (University of Sheffield, 1976); John Goldingay, *The Message of Isaiah 40-55: A Literary-Theological Commentary* (London: T&T Clark, 2005), 473–7.

<sup>186</sup> For the interpretation of the book of Job in terms of the influence of the creation theology, see Leo G. Perdue, *Wisdom & Creation: The Theology of Wisdom Literature* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1994), 123–92; “Creation in the Dialogues between Job and His Opponents,” in *Das Buch Hiob Und Seine Interpretationen: Beiträge Zum Hiob-Symposium Auf Dem Monte Verità Vom 14.-19. August 2005*, ed. Thomas Krüger et al., *Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments* (Zürich: TVZ, 2007), 197–216. Balentine in particular interprets Job’s texts in the relationship with “the grammars of creation”. See Samuel E. Balentine, *Job*, SHBC 10 (Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2006), 25–8.



regarded as the significant theme in the book of Job.<sup>187</sup> In the same viewpoint, the creation motif has been regarded as playing an important role in the formation of Deutero-Isaiah with the assumption that prophetic books are engaging with the literary tradition of creation.<sup>188</sup> Form-critical studies have shown that two motifs of creation and redemption in Deutero-Isaiah frequently are indicated in ‘hymnic praise’, ‘disputation speech’, and ‘words of salvation’ (*Heilswort*).<sup>189</sup> However, there are some problematic points in this area.

Firstly, the main criticism of the view that creation theology is the commonality between Job and Deutero-Isaiah arises from the uncertainty in usage of the term ‘creation’.<sup>190</sup> ‘Creation’ in the Hebrew Bible is mixed with diverse poetic metaphors and imageries, so much so that to define the literary relationship by the term ‘creation’ may provoke confusion.<sup>191</sup> For instance, Claus Westermann distinguishes ‘creation as birth’ from ‘creation as act’ and proposes ‘four main types of creation to be distinguished in the world outside Israel’: ‘creation by birth or by a succession of births’; ‘creation through struggle’; ‘creation as fashioning, making or forming’;

---

<sup>187</sup> For the references to the interpretation of wisdom texts as centering on creation, see Roland E. Murphy, “Wisdom and Creation,” *JBL* 104, no. 1 (1985): 3–11; Leo G. Perdue, *Wisdom in Revolt: Metaphorical Theology in the Book of Job*, JSOT 112 (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1991); James L. Crenshaw, “In Search of Divine Presence: Some Remarks Preliminary to a Theology of Wisdom,” *RE* 74, no. 3 (1977): 353–69; Rainer Albertz, *Weltschöpfung Und Menschenschöpfung: Untersucht Bei Deuterjesaja, Hiob Und in Den Psalmen* (Stuttgart: Calwer, 1974).

<sup>188</sup> For the creation theology in Deutero-Isaiah, refer to Barend Jacobus van der Merwe, *Pentateuchtradities in Die Prediking van Deuteriosaja: With a Summary in English* (Groningen: J. B. Wolters, 1955); Richard J. Clifford, “The Unity of the Book of Isaiah and Its Cosmogonic Language,” *CBQ* 55, no. 1 (1993): 1–17. Paas points out eighth century prophetic texts to use terms and motifs of creation such as Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah. See Stefan Paas, *Creation and Judgement: Creation Texts in Some Eighth Century Prophets* (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

<sup>189</sup> See Westermann, *Isaiah 40-66*, 8–21; Antoon Schoors, *I Am God Your Saviour: A Form-Critical Study of the Maingenres in Is. XL-LV*, SVT 24 (Leiden: Brill, 1973); Melugin, *Formation*.

<sup>190</sup> According to NODE, “creation” is defined by “the action or process of bringing something into existence”.

<sup>191</sup> O’Dowd divides the creation imageries into seven categories: ‘cosmic battle’, “kingship”, “theophany”, “lament and theodicy”, “cosmogony”, “creation and redemption”, and “wisdom and creation order”. See Ryan O’Dowd, “Creation Imagery,” in *DOTWPPW* (IVP, 2008), 60–63.

‘creation through utterance’.<sup>192</sup> Moreover, the description of ‘creation’ in the ancient Near Eastern literature as well as in the Hebrew Bible is very different from the present-day ideas of the origin of the universe and from the doctrinal concept in the unified process of creation discussed in traditional theology. The ancients certainly did not understand it as a scientific and complete theory, and the major difference between the modern and ancient descriptions of creation lies in how they deliver the idea. The ancients conceptualizing of creation such as in Ugaritic and Babylonian stories generally used mythological narrative.<sup>193</sup> The biblical narrative of creation in Gen 1-2 likewise adopts an interesting narrative in terms of the world for human beings, which is not a scientific theory. Likewise, when reading Job and Deutero-Isaiah, we find that the two books neither deal with the origin of the universe (‘cosmogony’), nor do they describe its gradual process as the primeval event as in Gen 1-2.<sup>194</sup> They are not designed to teach the lesson of the world’s order which is perceptible to humans nor share the ‘creation-thought’ built around Gen 1-2. Attempts to merge diverse biblical imageries and motifs related to creation into a modern idea of creation thus seem to have their limitations.<sup>195</sup>

Secondly, passages which may be judged to have the motif of ‘creation,’ do not necessarily contain the same literary purpose. When associating the two books via creation theology, scholars (Cheyne, Pfeiffer, Elliott, Terrien, André, Janzen, etc.) propose the motif of *Chaoskampf* and its mythological figures which symbolise chaos and disorder. They all suggest that authors of Job and Deutero-Isaiah utilised the mythological languages in ancient Near

---

<sup>192</sup> Claus Westermann, *Genesis 1-11: A Continental Commentary*, trans. John Scullion (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994), 26–47.

<sup>193</sup> Richard J. Clifford, “The Hebrew Scriptures and the Theology of Creation,” *TS* 46, no. 3 (1985): 507–23.

<sup>194</sup> Elliott, for instance, maintains that “the germ of creatio ex nihilo is to be seen in both books”. However, texts here are not concerned with such a theological dogma. Elliott, “Comparative,” 281–2.

<sup>195</sup> Paas points out problems of the use of the term “creation”. Paas, *Creation*, 1–20; “The biblical Hebrew does not know any word that corresponds with our concept of ‘creation’ both in the sense of the ‘actions’ of God that lead to an ordered universe as well as the ‘universe itself’, which results from those actions”. *Ibid.*, 55.

Eastern literature. Terms associated with the ‘chaos’ motif—such as לוֹיִתָּן (‘Leviathan’; Job 40:25 [Eng. 41:1]; cf. Isa 27:1), נָחִישׁ (‘serpent’; Job 26:13; cf. Isa 27:1), תַּנִּין (‘Tanin’; Job 7:12; Isa 51:9), יָם (‘Sea’; Job 26:11-12; Isa 50:2; 51:15), and רַהַב (‘Rahab’; Job 9:13; 26:13; Isa 51:9)<sup>196</sup>—are suggested as evidence of literary dependence between texts. This may be seen in Isa 51:9 and Job 7:12, 9:13 (cf. 26:12) which employ two mythological terms תַּנִּין and רַהַב;<sup>197</sup> see the following examples:

הִים אֲנִי אִם־תַּנִּין כִּי־תִשָּׂם עָלַי מִשְׁמֶר  
*Am I the Sea or the Sea-dragon Tannin, so that you set a guard over me? (Job 7:12)*<sup>198</sup>

אֱלֹהִים לֹא־יִשְׁיֵב אָפּוֹ (תַּחַתּוֹ) שְׁחָחוּ עֲזָרֵי רַהַב  
*God will not withdraw his anger; beneath him bow the helpers of Rahab (Job 9:13)*

בַּכֹּחַ רָגַע הִים (וּבְתוֹבְנָתוֹ) [וּבְתוֹבְנָתוֹ] מַחֵץ רַהַב  
*By his power, he stilled the Sea and by his skill<sup>199</sup> he struck down Rahab. (Job 26:12)*

עוֹרֵי עוֹרֵי לִבְשִׁיעַז זָרוּעַ יְהוָה עוֹרֵי כִימִי קֹדֶם דְּרוֹת עוֹלָמִים הֲלוֹא אֶת־הִיא הַמַּחְצֶבֶת  
 רַהַב מַחֲלֶלֶת תַּנִּין  
*Awake, awake, put on strength, O arm of Yahweh. Awake, as in days of old, generations of long ago. Was it not you hewing in pieces Rahab and piercing Tannin (the Sea-dragon)? (Isa 51:9)*

וְאֲנִכִּי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ רָגַע הִים וַיִּהְיוּ גַלָּיו יְהוָה צִבְאוֹת שְׁמוֹ  
*And I am Yahweh your God who stirs up<sup>200</sup> the Sea, so that its waves roar: Yahweh Almighty is his name. (Isa 51:15)*

<sup>196</sup> Rahab probably originated from an Akkadian word ra’ābu which means “tremble, rage” especially used for “the surging of water” (TDOT:XIII: 352) and for describing the chaotic force in God’s battle in Job 9:13, 26:12 and in Is 51:9. It is generally acknowledged to be an allusion from the Babylonian epic, Enuma Elish, which shows Marduk’s battle with the Tiamat. See A. Caquot, “Ga’ar,” *TDOT:III* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 49–53. Also see TDOT:XIII, 354–357. Another mythological figure, dragon (Tannin) has a Canaanite background as the chaos monster in primeval times and in the conflict between Baal and Tannin. Recent scholars have debated whether these imageries imply mythological, symbolic or realistic reference in each context and contain the metaphoric link of chaos in creation narrative. See John Day, *God’s Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea: Echoes of a Canaanite Myth in the Old Testament* (University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 35; Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1985); “God and Leviathan in Isaiah 27:1,” *BS* 155, no. 620 (1998): 423–36. Also see John A. Emerton, “Leviathan and Ltn : The Vocalization of the Ugaritic Word for the Dragon,” *VT* 32, no. 3 (1982): 326–31.

<sup>197</sup> Pfeiffer, “Dual,” 201; Terrien, “Quelques,” 305–6; Janzen, “Nature,” 467, 474.

<sup>198</sup> English translations of biblical texts mostly are of my own unless otherwise indicated.

<sup>199</sup> Following qere, וּבְתוֹבְנָתוֹ (‘his insight’) rather than kethib וּבְתוֹבְנָתוֹ which is a form of scribal miswriting (See BHS; Hartley, Clines).

Nonetheless, when considering the circumstances in which each context makes use of specific vocabulary, it is unlikely that the usage of these terms related to the motif of *Chaoskampf* was originally intended to refer to a stage of the primeval creation. In particular, technical terms such as ים ('Sea'), רהב ('Rahab'), and תנין ('Tanin') do not necessarily have to be interpreted against the background of Canaanite and Babylonian creation myth.<sup>201</sup> On the one hand, in Job 7:12, Job bitterly cries out that God treats him like the hostile forces 'Sea' and 'Dragon', which provoke the divine anger and which are on God's black-list. Job 9:13 highlights that the divine anger which Job experiences is the same as that which God exercised against the 'helpers of Rahab'; here Job has already acknowledged that no one can comprehend what God will do or can stop it, if God has determined what God will do (9:4-12). Just as God mastered the 'helpers of Rahab', a man like Job is not worthy to argue against God (9:13). Finally, the phrase רגע הים 'to still the Sea' in 26:12a—'shattering Rahab' in 26:12b; 'piercing the fleeting serpent' in 26:13—might be involved with the act of creation referring to the divine battle against chaotic forces, but it emphasises God's power which primordial chaos lacks. On the other hand, when Deutero-Isaiah uses mythological imageries in Isa 51:9, 15, a similar problem arises. It is difficult to determine whether or not they refer to the motif of primeval creation, since these expressions in the Exodus motif could refer to Israel's enemies. For instance, the term 'Rahab' (רהב) is used for Egypt (Isa 30:7) and 'Tanin' (תנין) for Pharaoh (Ezek 29:3), so much so that interpreters have not reached a consensus as to the meaning in Isa 51:9.<sup>202</sup> In my view, in fact,

---

<sup>200</sup> The Hebrew verb רגע could have two meanings, 'to calm down' (Nip, Hip; Jer 47:6; Deut 28:65) or 'stir up' (Qal; Jer 31:35; Job 26:12). I follow 'to stir up'.

<sup>201</sup> Two terms תנין and לויתן can be translated as a sort of 'reptile' like 'crocodile', 'serpent' (TDOT:XV, 726-31), הים is the term of 'sea' as a geographical unit (TDOT:VI, 97), and רהב can mean either 'mythical sea monster' or 'a name for Egypt' (DCH:VII, 425). Rütterswörden claims that the word רהב appears neither in the Ugaritic texts nor in the pre-exilic texts in the OT, so that 'the association of Rahab with the other figures is a product of the exilic period' (TDOT:XIII, 355). Thus, it is ambiguous to say that these are referring to mythological terms.

<sup>202</sup> Regarding interpretive debate, see Jan Leunis Koole, *Isaiah III. Volume II / Isaiah 49-55* (HCOT; Peeters, 1998), 172-5; John D. W. Watts, *Isaiah 34-66* (Revised ed.; WBC v. 25; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2005), 211; Oswalt notes that "Tag. and Vulg. translate 'rahav' with 'mighty men' and 'proud one,' respectively"; John N. Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 40-66* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans,

similar expressions—‘drying up the sea’ and ‘making a path in the water’ (Isa 51:10) and ‘stilling the Sea’ (Isa 51:15; cf. Job 26:12)—in their own contexts refer neither to a creation motif nor to an Exodus motif, but they are used for highlighting the nature of the Creator in the divine struggle against evil and chaotic enemies, and in the astonishing deliverance of His people.

In such a common presentation of mythological imagery, there is no necessary causative link with creation activity to remind readers of ‘creation faith’, in that the usage in each context has different literary roles and purposes.<sup>203</sup> The shared language rather designates God’s sovereign power and governance over cosmic and political forces in Job and Deutero-Isaiah, and is used for establishing the importance of Yahweh and the incomparability of Israel’s God; on the one hand, Job’s usage of mythological terms aims at underscoring Job’s miserable situation, mistreated by God (Job 7:12) and the impossibility of contending against God (Job 9:13; 26:12); on the other hand, specific vocabularies would appear to indicate God’s power which will deliver his people from evil forces (‘Rahab’, ‘Sea’) as described in Isa 51:9, 15.

Lastly, the question is: ‘Is the theme of creation distinctive in Job and Deutero-Isaiah or well-known thoughts on which biblical authors could draw without difficulty?’ Needless to say, it is definitely not distinctive. It is not only prevalent in ancient Near Eastern documents, but also is a very basic thought of the Hebrew Bible. For instance, similar language can be found in many texts in Psalms and Amos, in order to elevate the supremacy of Yahweh as a true God. Further, since Hermann Gunkel’s book, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, was published in 1895, people have been convinced that Babylonian myths in the pre-history of Israel were

---

1998), 339; John Goldingay, *Isaiah 40-55: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary* (ed. David Payne; ICC vol. 2; London: T&T Clark, 2006), 236–7.

<sup>203</sup> Clines argues that “there is nothing in the OT to suggest that the battle was a stage in or precondition for creation”. See Clines, *Job 1-20*, 233; Contra Carol A. Newsom, “Job,” in *The New Interpreter’s Bible: 1&2 Maccabees, Job, Psalms*, NIB 4 (Abingdon Press, 1997), 395, 411.

sources of the creation theology in the Hebrew Bible.<sup>204</sup> It is not so novel that documents relating creation myths in ancient Near East influenced Jewish religion—for example, the famous Babylonian creation story, *Enuma elish*—and then they have been debated as having analogies and contrasts with biblical materials; to be sure, this does not mean that Deutero-Isaiah and Job used particular Ugaritic and Akkadian texts.<sup>205</sup> All that can be said is that because there exist the plentiful motif of *Chaoskampf* and linguistic resemblances in other foreign cultures around Israel, we have no reason to accept that one text utilised a specific *Leitmotif* from a literary source. Rather than thinking of literary dependence, it would be more likely that there were cultural phenomena from which biblical authors would draw out a kind of *Chaoskampf* motif and terms.

#### 2.1.2.2 *Monotheism*

Next, the idea of monotheism has to be discussed with the subject of ‘creation’. The term ‘monotheism’ has been considered either as a significant common motif in Job and Deutero-Isaiah or as a religious belief of Deutero-Isaiah. For instance, Pfeiffer says that Deutero-Isaiah includes the monotheistic idea which is lacking in the book of Job which places greater emphasis on anthropocentric and anthropomorphic ideas.<sup>206</sup> Elliott takes it for granted that the entire book of Job is shaped by a monotheistic idea and sees Job and Deutero-Isaiah as promoting monotheism (Job 9:24; Isa 44:6b).<sup>207</sup> However, their arguments are flawed in several points.

---

<sup>204</sup> See Hermann Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit : eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung über Gen 1 und Ap Joh 12* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1895).

<sup>205</sup> Richard Clifford supposes that Deutero-Isaiah and Job referred to “traditional cosmogonies” in ancient Near Eastern sources. See Richard J. Clifford, *Creation Accounts in the Ancient Near East and in the Bible*, CBQ 26 (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association, 1994), 163–76, 185–203.

<sup>206</sup> Pfeiffer, “Dual.”

<sup>207</sup> Elliott, “Comparative.”

The primary problem with the term ‘monotheism’ is that it is inclined to fit a modern religious and philosophical notion, not an ancient ideology.<sup>208</sup> Very often in the study of the Old Testament, ‘monolatry’—worshipping the one God without rejecting the existence of other gods—is treated equally as ‘monotheism’.<sup>209</sup> However, if one would like to use it, monotheism should be strictly distinguished from ‘monolatry’ and ‘henotheism’; in many cases, texts do not clarify ‘monotheism’. As a matter of fact, the existence of foreign gods is a common assumption as stated by texts, while Israelites in their possessed land are required to worship the only one God. In the usage of the term ‘monotheism’, Jewish and Christian interpreters have been uncomfortable in identifying such a modern term with the biblical idea. R. W. L. Moberly responds to the issue, whether ‘monotheism’ should be retained or abandoned; he states that ‘probably the most obviously appealing strategy is to retain it, but to concentrate on careful definition of what is, and is not, meant by the term in its various contexts’.<sup>210</sup>

---

<sup>208</sup> Hans Wildberger, “Der Monotheismus Deuteronomias,” in *Beiträge Zur Alttestamentlichen Theologie* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977), 506–30; Millard C. Lind, “Monotheism, Power, and Justice : A Study in Isaiah 40-55,” *CBQ* 46, no. 3 (1984): 432–46; Hywel Clifford, “Deutero-Isaiah and Monotheism,” in *Prophecy and Prophets in Ancient Israel Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar* (ed. John Day; NY: T&T Clark, 2010), 267–89; Against the monotheistic idea in Deutero-Isaiah, see Nathan MacDonald, “Monotheism and Isaiah,” in *Interpreting Isaiah* (Nottingham: Apollos, 2009), 43–61; R.W.L. Moberly, “How Appropriate Is ‘Monotheism’ as a Category for Biblical Interpretation?,” in *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism* (ed. Stuckenbruck Loren T. and Wendy E. Sproston North; Early Christianity in Context 263; London: T&T Clark, 2004), 216–34.

<sup>209</sup> The term, “monotheism”, which means the religious belief in the existence of the only one God who is worthy to be praised, has been coined by Henry Moore’s systematic presentation (1614-1687) of the Christian gospel. Yet, it should be clearly distinguished from “monolatry” and “henotheism” which also acknowledge the existence of other deities as worshipping the only one deity alone; “monolatry” whose first usage is suggested by Schleiermacher and which “is used of devotion to one god without denying the existence of others”; “henotheism” which “is a religious stage in which temporarily one god was adored and the plurality of gods disappeared from view.” See Nathan MacDonald, “The Origin of ‘Monotheism,’” in *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*, ECC 263 (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 204–6, 213–4.

<sup>210</sup> Moberly, “Monotheism,” 233; Moberly criticises Regina Schwartz’s thesis from the Christian and Jewish perspective; R.W.L. Moberly, “Is Monotheism Bad for You?: Some Reflections on God, the Bible, and Life in the Light of Regina Schwartz’s the Curse of Cain,” in *The God of Israel* (ed. R. P. Gordon; University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 64; Cambridge; NY: Cambridge UP, 2007), 94–112; Ronald E. Clements, “Monotheism and the God of Many Names,” in *The God of Israel* (ed. R. P.

Furthermore, there are specific passages in Job and Deutero-Isaiah which contradict monotheism, but which possibly support the polytheistic idea. In the scene of God's heavenly assembly, God is portrayed as a deity having children, בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים ('sons of God'; Job 1:6; 2:1) who come to 'present themselves before Yahweh'. The existence of other divine beings in the counsel here seems to originate from the early stages of thought on the nature of the deity as observed in Deut 32:8 and Exod 15:11; before the later stage of history where the phrase 'sons of God' is interpreted as other supernatural forces such as the "morning stars" (Job 38:7) and 'angelic forces' (33:23-24).<sup>211</sup> So, if the prose-tale can be taken securely as an original part of the book of Job, the argument from monotheism loses its significance. In Deutero-Isaiah, the concept of the divine assembly, expressed by the phrase וְאִישׁ עֲצָתוֹ יוֹדִיעֵנּוּ—'who has been the counsellor to teach him' in Isa 40:13b<sup>212</sup>—goes against monotheistic belief. R. N. Whybray traces the imagery of Yahweh's council or counsellor from Isa 40:13-14 and argues that the idea of the divine assembly originates, to a considerable extent, in the perception of the deity at

---

Gordon; University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 64; Cambridge ; NY: Cambridge UP, 2007), 47–59.

<sup>211</sup> Christian and Jewish interpreters suggest that this term in a monotheistic framework signifies courtiers serving a deity: "godly being, divine creatures" (Tur-Sinai), "divine beings" (Gordon), "angels, slaves" (Dhorme, Hartley; cf. Job 4:18), and "angelic forces" (LXX, Tag). "The sons of God" is retained in other versions like the Vulgate and the Peshitta: E. Dhorme, *A Commentary on the Book of Job* (trans. H. Knight; London: Nelson, 1967), 5; Robert Gordis, *The Book of Job: Commentary, New Translation and Special Studies* (Moreshet Series : Studies in Jewish History, Literature and Thought vol. 2; NY: JTSA, 1978), 13–4; Naphtali H. Tur-Sinai, *The Book of Job: A New Commentary* (Jerusalem: Kiryath Sepher, 1967), 6; Hartley, *Job*, 71. On the other hand, Driver sees this phrase as "individuals of the class of gods"; S. R. Driver, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Job* (ed. George Buchanan Gray; ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1964), 10; also Clines and Gray suppose that denoting the term as angelic beings is the later interpretation; Clines, *Job 1-20*, 18–9. The parallel expression "the morning stars" (Job 38:7; cf. 1 Kgs 22:19) set alongside this term (בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים) could reflect a theological shift "from monolatry to monotheism". Here, the interpretation designating "family of the sons of God" (Ugaritic), and "physical descendant" (Canaanite) seems to be appropriate as developed in the earlier period (Deut 32:8); John Gray, *The Book of Job* (ed. David J. A. Clines; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2010), 125–6.

<sup>212</sup> G ("and who has been his counselor, to instruct him?"; LXE) and Vg ("or who have been his counselor, and have taught him?") put an interrogative pronoun.



the time of Deutero-Isaiah.<sup>213</sup> He further argues that the phrase אֶת־מִי נִוְעַץ ('Whom has he consulted?') in Isa 40:14a is connected to the characteristic of the royal council meeting with wise advisers.<sup>214</sup> In the given context, this expression highlights that Yahweh does not need the help of the heavenly council to make a decision, and portrays Him simply as a chief deity, assigning all the possibilities of the world's control to Yahweh. Thomas Römer argues that Deutero-Isaiah 'had to integrate into this deity functions traditionally attributed to goddesses and to demons or evil gods' (Isa 42:13-14; 46:3; 45:7-8; 49:15) and concludes that 'this evolution makes it difficult to characterise the Hebrew Bible as the result of a straightforward evolution from polytheism to monotheism'.<sup>215</sup>

When it is argued that the text of Deutero-Isaiah speaks of monotheism—cf. Isa 44:6b ('I am the first and I am the last, and besides me there is no God')—scholars suppose that the uniqueness of Yahweh is described in a literary form of 'polemic' statements against other gods, to highlight that foreign deities are not reliable deities at all. For example, Elliott states: 'the writer formulated and expressed his monotheism by pointing out the folly and vanity of idol worship'.<sup>216</sup> However, the polemic rhetoric in Deutero-Isaiah does not necessarily support the monotheistic idea. It is like saying that Yahweh of Israel is shouting out to foreign idols: 'You are not a god, but foolish man-made wood and metal.' It is no more than the process of denigrating and mocking idols and their gods that results from their mundane manufacturing by idol-makers (Isa 44:9:20).

---

<sup>213</sup> For expressions of the divine assembly See R. N. Whybray, *The Heavenly Counsellor in Isaiah XI 13-14: A Study of the Sources of the Theology of Deutero-Isaiah*, SOTSMS 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1971), 39–48.

<sup>214</sup> Whybray argues that "in Isa. xl 14 Yahweh, as king, is pictured as holding a royal decision". See *ibid.*, 33.

<sup>215</sup> Thomas C. Römer, "Yhwh, the Goddess and Evil: Is 'Monotheism' an Adequate Concept to Describe the Hebrew Bible's Discourses about the God of Israel?," *Verbum et Ecclesia* 34, no. 2 (2013): 5, <http://www.ve.org.za/index.php/VE/article/view/841>.

<sup>216</sup> Elliott, "Comparative," 205.

Therefore, the term ‘monotheism’ ought to be avoided in explaining the relationship of Job and Deutero-Isaiah. Both texts commonly describe the superiority and sovereignty of Yahweh, in order to underscore that Yahweh is the only important and true God who created the world. There are of course real differences between them. While in Job there is no attack upon other gods and idols and there is no polemic against other gods, in Deutero-Isaiah much of what is being said about the superiority of God is related to attacking the worship of other deities.

### 2.1.3 Terms Linked to Common Themes

In addition, interestingly, Hebrew words, phrases, and expressions are suggested as certain evidence in describing common themes in Job and Deutero-Isaiah which we have looked at; I examine the frequently mentioned expressions which are linked with two proposed themes; suffering servant and creation.

#### 2.1.3.1 *Terms of Suffering Servant*

Let us see parallels related to the theme of the suffering servant; Cheyne provides seven verbal and thematic resemblances between the figure of Job and the suffering servant in Deutero-Isaiah (Job 1:8//Isa 53:9; Job 2:7; 7:5, 15//Isa 53:3,4; Job 42:10//Isa 53:12; Job 42:8, 10//Isa 53:12; Job 19:25-27//Isa 53:10-12); Jean Bastiaens indicates lexical correspondences between passages in Job 16-19, which address Job’s affliction and the fate of the wicked, and texts of Deutero-Isaiah (Job 16:7-17//Isa 50:4-9; 53:7-10a; Job 16:19-21//Isa 49:4; 50:7-9; Job 17:1-9//Isa 50:6; 52:13-14; Job 19:7-27//Isa 49:7; 52:14aa-b; 53:2-3, 4b, 11aa); Cooper summarises eighteen parallel verses.<sup>217</sup> However, verbal links alone may not prove that there is a commonality of the suffering servant running through both of them. Firstly, the most cited parallel expression, often considered a definite connection, occurs in Job 16:17 and Isa 53:9:<sup>218</sup>

---

<sup>217</sup> See Bastiaens, “Suffering”; Cooper, “Suffering,” 194–6.

<sup>218</sup> Bastiaens, “Suffering,” 423–4; Cooper, “Suffering,” 196; Brinks, “Thematic,” 185.

על לא-חמס בכפי ותפלתי זכה

*Because there is no violence in my palms, and my prayer is pure (Job 16:17)*

על לא-חמס עשה ולא מרמה בפיו

*Because he had done no violence and no deceit with his mouth (Isa 53:9b)*

Does the common phrase, על לא-חמס ('because of non-violence'),<sup>219</sup> become compelling evidence to confirm the common distinctive motif of the suffering servant? On the one hand, the confession of Job's non-violence in Job 16:17a is presented as Job's answer to the divine mistreatment and assault against Job. Both the mark of 'non-violence' in his hand (v. 17a) and the prayer to show his pure religiosity (v. 17b) present a firm determination to prove his innocence, noting that the present sufferings cannot be the result of his wrongdoings. On the other hand, the non-violence and non-deceit of the suffering servant in Isa 53:9b result in his burial with the wicked and the rich in 53:9a, but the death of the servant shows that he was an innocent man. Accordingly, while in Deutero-Isaiah it serves to accuse people who failed to acknowledge the servant's innocence and voluntary service, Job's wording is used as a rhetorical device to dispute the fact that, because of Job's non-violence, his suffering is unfair, and to call for the immediate vindication of God. This expression is very unusual and seems to be a technical term having contrasting tones; perhaps derived from popular usage.

A second noteworthy parallel appears in the usage of the Hebrew root פגע in Job 7:20b (noun, *hpx*, מפגע) and Isa 53:6b (hiphil perfect, הפגיע)<sup>220</sup> where the two figures are portrayed as a target beaten by God:

למה שמתני למפגע לך ואהיה עלי<sup>221</sup> למשא

---

<sup>219</sup> In Job 16:17, the conjunction, על, is properly rendered as causal case, "because" rather than "although" in order to indicate the contrast between "the divine assaults" and "the innocence", not between "weeping" and "innocence". See Clines, *Job 1-20*, 387. Otherwise, TNK, Tur-Sinai, Gordis, and Hartley render it as "although". See Tur-Sinai, *Job*, 268; Gordis, *Job*, 178; Hartley, *Job*, 259. On the other hand, in Deutero-Isaiah the conjunction על can be understood in a "concessive" sense where the innocence of the servant is contrasting with the wicked of the land who mistreated his tomb. See Westermann, *Isaiah 40-66*, 254; Klaus Baltzer, *Deutero-Isaiah: A Commentary*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 393. However, the "causal" (LXX, Vg) usage as "because" is a better rendering to indicate an ironical tone. See Clines, *I*, 20; Goldingay, *Isaiah vol.2*, 318.

<sup>220</sup> Cooper, "Suffering," 196; Brinks, "Thematic," 147.

*Why do you make me your striking target? And why am I a burden to you? (Job 7:20b, cf. 36:32)*

וַיְהִי הַפְּגִיעַ בּוֹ אֶת עוֹן כָּלֵנוּ

*But Yahweh let the guilt of all of us strike him (Isa 53:6b)*

However, in each passage, the way they are described as the mark of the divine attack is dissimilar. Job, rejecting the continuation of his life and the excessive divine attention, is saying to God ‘leave me alone’ (Job 7:16, 19), and is asking why he became the ‘object of hostile contact’<sup>222</sup> by God, even though he is a mere individual among all human beings. Job’s sin, if there are sinful deeds, is too trifling to deserve to draw God’s attention, and here his initial question—‘If I sin, what have I done to you? You, watcher of men!’ (7:20a)—has an ironical sense, since God does not have to be affected by an individual in suffering (7:20b).<sup>223</sup> The emphasis on human insignificance is intended for a plea to God for withdrawing the harsh attack on him. On the other hand, the nuance in Isa 53:6b has neither an ironical nor a disputational tone, but Deutero-Isaiah states that the affliction of the servant results from Yahweh’s decision by which consequences of people’s misbehaviours were made to strike the servant. The pain of the Yahweh’s servant is associated with the issue of others’ iniquities and restoration, not with his own wrongdoings.

---

<sup>221</sup> The prepositional phrase עָלַי (“to me” or “to myself”; KJV, RSV, JPS, Good) in MT is the one of the eighteen passages which the scribes have conventionally modified; tiqqunei Sopherim (“corrections of the Scribes”) (Gordis, 82-3). This textual change is the adjustment of the scribes in order to avoid the negative and improper aspects and expressions in describing God. The original reading therefore should be עָלֶיךָ (“to you”) which is a reading supported by LXX and other manuscripts (Seow, 510-1).

Blommerde suggests a better reading as עָלִי “Most High” ‘used as a vocative, instead of עָלַי (Job 10:2; Ps 7:9; 32:4; 41:8; 68:30; 141:3; Lam 3:61); Anton C. M. Blommerde, *Northwest Semitic Grammar and Job*, BO 22 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969), 50.

<sup>222</sup> Gordis, Job, 82.

<sup>223</sup> Hartley, *Job*, 152.

A third corresponding point occurs in the usage of the word מוֹת ('death'). The verbal connection in Job 7:15 and Isa 53:12b could almost make us conclude that the two figures prefer 'death' to 'life':<sup>224</sup>

וּתְבַחַר מִחֲנֹק נַפְשִׁי מוֹת מֵעֲצָמוֹתִי<sup>225</sup>

*So that my soul would choose strangling, death rather than this existence. (Job 7:15)*

תַּחַת אֲשֶׁר הָעֵרָה לְמוֹת נַפְשׁוֹ

*for he exposed his life to death (Isa 53:12b)*

Throughout the dialogue, Job confesses the desire to end his life, cursing the day of his birth (Job 3:21; 10:21-22). The brevity of human life against the longevity of trees and water appears very insignificant (14:8-9, 11), but death would appear to be the last place to escape the divine wrath (14:13-14). As Job longs for death in order to recover his intimate relationship and communication with God, he despairs because of the hiddenness of God (Job 23:8-9; cf. Isa 45:15), and is terrified by the shadow of coming death (23:16-17). On the other hand, no lamenting and complaining of coming death are heard from the voice of the servant in Deutero-Isaiah—'he opened not his mouth' (Isa 53:7)—and therefore he does not ask to encounter

---

<sup>224</sup> Cooper, "Suffering," 196. Hartley notes that "in Isaiah the thought of victory over death is developed further than in the book of Job (14:7-17)". See Hartley, Job, 14-5.

<sup>225</sup> This term עֲצָם means literally "bone", "substance", and "being" (BDB), but commentators have suggested different renderings about the expression מֵעֲצָמוֹתִי. On the one hand, this prepositional phrase מֵעֲצָמוֹתִי could be translated as "rather than my bones" or "from my bones", if the term נַפֶּשׁ is rendered as "throat", not as "individuality" or "person"; so it permits this translation in v. 15, "my throat prefers suffocation, Death more than my bones" (See Good, 66). However, to understand עֲצָם simply as "bone" or "body-frame" would be odd rendering. As Clines says (Clines, 165), if two terms עֲצָמוֹתִי ("my existence") and נַפְשִׁי ("my soul") can be rendered as designating the entire being or substance of Job, the whole sentence may be understood most naturally (also, Gordis, 81). On the other hand, many commentators emend מֵעֲצָמוֹתִי to מֵעֲצָבוֹתִי ("rather than my sufferings (or pains)") as in Job 9:28 and Ps 147:3 (Driver-Gray, 72; Dhorme, 106-7; Terrien, 134; Gray, 181). Although this could be another direction of interpretation, there seems to be no compulsory reason of the emendation. Another emendation has been proposed by Sarna (also Hartley, 148). He regards the preposition מֵ of מֵעֲצָמוֹתִי as "the enclitic of the preceding (מֵ)מוֹת", so that the translation becomes "so that my soul (I) choose strangulation, my bones (=I) death". See Nahum M. Sarna, "Some Instances of the Enclitic -M in Job," JJS 6, no. 2 (1955): 109. Recently, Seow reads the phrase מוֹת מֵעֲצָמוֹתִי by making the verb מֵאֲסֵתִי in v. 16 as the relative clause. This permits the translation, "Death more than my body-frame that I abhor" (Seow 508).

Yahweh. (Isa 53:7). The death of the suffering servant in Deutero-Isaiah is given as his destiny to achieve the divine will (Isa 53:10) and as the route along which he must pass to bring the ultimate victory (53:12a). Consequently, the suffering servant is likely to be portrayed as ‘a victorious warrior leading a huge company of defeated opponents’<sup>226</sup> and as a king winning a great victory over death and Sheol (cf. Isa 40:10-11).

In addition, there is another reason why those connections cannot prove the relationship between Job and Deutero-Isaiah via the motif of Deutero-Isaiah’s suffering servant. Linguistic resemblances with passages of the suffering servant in Deutero-Isaiah appear in depicting other figures in the book of Job. For example, in Elihu’s speech, phrases in which Elihu speculates about himself create several verbal links with Deutero-Isaiah, and as Curtis argues, this makes us regard Elihu as a suffering servant (Job 32:8//Isa 50:4-5; Job 33:3//Isa 50:4; Job 33:7//Isa 42:2-3).<sup>227</sup> In Bildad’s speech, terms to describe the inevitable fate of the wicked also have linguistic similarities with the servant in Deutero-Isaiah (Job 18:5-21; Isa 52:14a; 53:4a, 8).<sup>228</sup>

#### 2.1.3.2 *Terms of Creation*

The strong linguistic connection attaching the two books to ‘creation’<sup>229</sup> occurs in the usage of Hebrew verbs such as ברא (‘to create’), יצר (‘to form’), עשה (‘to do’, ‘to make’), כון (‘to establish’), and פעל (‘to make’, ‘to accomplish’).<sup>230</sup> In particular, three synonymous terms—ברא, יצר, and עשה—are often referred to in relation to the concept of the creation of the world.<sup>231</sup> Firstly, there is the unique common phrase in the Hebrew Bible, עשה שלום (‘to make peace’) in Job 25:2 and Isa 45:7. Secondly, imagery in ‘making’ (עשה) and ‘forming’ (יצר)

<sup>226</sup> Goldingay, *Message*, 517.

<sup>227</sup> Curtis, “Elihu,” 10:36.

<sup>228</sup> Bastiaens, “Suffering,” 430–1.

<sup>229</sup> Pfeiffer, “Dual,” 199; Elliott, “Comparative,” 275–85; Terrien, “Quelques,” 305–6, 309–10; Brinks, “Thematic,” 190–235.

<sup>230</sup> TDOT:II, 246.

<sup>231</sup> Elliott, “Comparative,” 279–82; Terrien, “Quelques,” 302–3.

‘pottery’ with ‘clay’ (חמר) seem to involve creation by God (Job 10:9; cf. אשר-בעפר יסודם, ‘whose foundation is in the dust’ in 4:19; Isa 45:9; cf. 41:25). Thirdly, several terms are associated with building and artisan imageries to represent the divine action in creation; see the following idiomatic phrases:

(1) the idiom, יסד ארץ (‘laying the foundation of the earth’) (Job 38:4; Isa 48:13; cf. 51:13, 51:16; cf. Ps 104:5)<sup>232</sup>;

(2) the idiom, נטה קו, (‘stretching the measuring line’) which means the artisan’s work and implies a different meaning—the divine action of Creator in Job 38:5, but in Isa 44:13, the measuring work by the idol-maker (cf. Lam 2:8; Zech 1:16);

(3) the idiom, נטה שמים, (‘stretching out the heavens’) (Job 9:8; Isa 40: 22; 44:24; 45:12; 51:13; cf. 2 Sam 22:10; Ps:18:19; 104:2; 144:5; Jer 10:12; 51:15; Zech 12:1).

Moreover, there are terms describing the entire cosmos. For instance, Elliott argues that ‘the character and order of the universe depicted in Deutero Isaiah and Job’ which ‘is very much like that of the Babylonian concept’, can be structured in three parts such as ‘heaven,’ ‘earth’, and ‘the underworld.’<sup>233</sup> For this, interpreters usually suggest specific links between the two books; חוג (‘circle’, ‘horizon’; Isa 40:22; 44:13; Job 22:14 (noun); 26:10 (verb); cf. Prov 8:27; Sir 43:12) (Pfeiffer, Elliott, Terrien);<sup>234</sup> לקצות-הארץ (‘to the ends of the earth’; Isa 40:28; Job 28:24; cf. Isa 41:5, 9) (Pfeiffer).<sup>235</sup>

Nevertheless, all these relevant terms and idioms associated with ‘creation’ neither necessarily refers to the primordial event of creation nor to the creation myth.<sup>236</sup> The usage of the verb עשה

---

<sup>232</sup> Theodore M. Ludwig, “Traditions of the Establishing of the Earth in Deutero-Isaiah,” *JBL* 92, no. 3 (1973): 345–57.

<sup>233</sup> Elliott, “Comparative,” 282.

<sup>234</sup> Seybold supposes that based on the fact that this form of words appears only in relatively late Hebrew and the specialized meaning, the word ‘circle’ results from ‘late secondary development under the influence of Babylonian technology, and cosmology’ and means ‘describe a circle’ or ‘incise a circular line’ (TDOT:IV, 245).

<sup>235</sup> In these two verses, ‘the ends of the earth’ is associated with the totality of the world and identifies God’s supernatural power over the created world.

<sup>236</sup> Paas, *Creation*, 65.

is not restricted to creation as the primeval event, and the expression of ‘making pots’ only speaks of the skilful act of the artisan. Passage of Job and Deutero-Isaiah mainly speak of a Creator rather than ‘creation’; e.g., Isa 45:7, 18; 54:16 (ברא), Isa 45:9, 18 (יצר); Isa 45:7, 12, 1 (עשה); Job 26:8. The emphasis on creation imagery is not on the establishment of the world order, but on the control over the world in Job and on the transformation of the creation order in Deutero-Isaiah.

#### 2.1.4 Summary

Although extensive researches have suggested common themes in Job and Deutero-Isaiah, such exhibitions are unsatisfactory; although they might have useful thoughts. With certain terms such as ‘theodicy’, ‘suffering servant’, ‘creation’, and ‘monotheism’, I argued that those themes are too vague, deliver different ideas in each context, and are commonplace prevalent in other texts. Moreover, it is unlikely that technical words, related to suffering servant and creation, reflect a distinctive association between the two books; though this does not mean that none of linguistic parallels evince any relationships.

#### 2.2 Examining Parallel Expressions

Now, let us take a close look at detailed examples of parallel expressions. The most reasonable verbal connections in recent survey for this area appear to focus on a few chapters of the poetic dialogue—especially Job 3, 5, 9, 12 and 25—while corresponding words in Deutero-Isaiah appear in sporadic passages. If we find same verbal expressions, we need to ask the questions: ‘do they mean the same thing in both texts?’, ‘are they common prevalent expressions which we can find in other texts?’ Here, I will present five expressions, and will state reasons why those verbal links could not demonstrate a particular literary relationship;<sup>237</sup> the first four

---

<sup>237</sup> I have chosen these five examples from cases that in recent years biblical scholars have most frequently proposed. See 1.1.1.1 ‘Shared Vocabulary’ in Chapter 1.



examples are found in Job 9:2-13 and Isa 40:12-31, 44:24-45:13 and the final one in Job 12:9 and Isa 41:20.

### 2.2.1 ‘Mighty in power’ (Job 9:4; Isa 40:26)

To begin with, the phrase **וְאִמִּיץ כַּח** (‘mighty in power’)<sup>238</sup> only occurs in Job 9:4 (cf. 9:19a) and Isa 40:26 within the Hebrew Bible:<sup>239</sup>

חכם לבב וְאִמִּיץ כַּח מִי־הַקֹּשֶׁה אֵלָיו וַיִּשְׁלֵם

*He is a wise one in heart and is a mighty one in power*<sup>240</sup>—*Who has disputed against him and has remained uninjured? (Job 9:4)*

שְׂאוּ־מְרוֹם עֵינֵיכֶם וּרְאוּ מִי־בְרָא אֱלֹהֵהּ הַמוֹצִיָּא בַּמִּסְפָּר צְבָאָם לְכֻלָּם בְּשֵׁם יְקָרָא מְרַב אֲוִנִים וְאִמִּיץ כַּח אִישׁ לֹא נֶעְדָּר

*Lift up on high your eyes. And see: who creates these? He who brings out their host by number, calls them all by name by abundance of strength, and as a mighty one in power;*<sup>241</sup> *no one will be missing (Isa 40:26)*

From this same phrase, Terrien speaks of ‘divine transcendence’ as a common motif, saying that ‘Job speaks of the futility of human bravado in the face of the destructive omnipotence which provokes the erosion of mountains, earthquakes and eclipses (9:5-7)’ and that ‘Deutero-Isaiah sings the omnipresence of God the creator who looks for the redemption of human

<sup>238</sup> Furthermore, Job 36:19b (‘Will your cry for help avail to keep you from distress, or all the force of your strength?’) from Elihu’s speech, in an unusual way, uses the phrase **מֵאֲמַצֵּי־כַח** (lit. ‘exertions of power’ (*hap. leg.*) highlighting that all sorts of Job’s ‘powerful efforts’ are useless. Refer to NIDOTE:I, 441.

<sup>239</sup> Pfeiffer, “Dual,” 203; Elliott, “Comparative,” 196; Terrien, “Quelques,” 301–2; C. L. Brinks, “Job and Deutero Isaiah: The Use and Abuse of Traditions,” *BI:AJCA* 20, no. 4-5 (2012): 412; Nurmela, *Mouth*, 8.

<sup>240</sup> Some (Terrien, Tur-Sinai, Gordis) note that the phrase, **חכם לבב וְאִמִּיץ כַּח** (‘wise in heart’ and ‘mighty in strength’) should be applied to humans and everyone, not to God and then this first colon is viewed as a concessive clause, ‘though, however’. However, the first colon as a *casus pendens* modifies the direct object the suffix of **אֵלָיו** in the second colon, God (Driver-Gray, Dhorme, Hartley, Clines).

<sup>241</sup> The phrase, **מְרַב אֲוִנִים וְאִמִּיץ כַּח**, does not refer to the heavenly bodies (Kimchi, Torrey, Merendino), but is attributed to Yahweh’s power (Westermann, Koole, Goldingay). The 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> reads **וְאִמִּץ כֹּחוֹ** (noun), instead of **וְאִמִּיץ כַּח** (adjective) in the MT. Variants acknowledge the phrase as two nouns: G renders this as *καὶ ἐν κράτει ισχύος*, Tg as “might of power,” and Vg as “strength and power.” Moreover, the noun **וְאִמִּץ** makes a clearer parallelism with **מְרַב אֲוִנִים**. And the wording **כֹּחוֹ** of 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> is more unambiguous, namely, that the “strength” belongs to God (Goldingay v1, 124-5; Koole, 116). Thus, the reading of 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> is reasonable in this case.

beings (Isa 40:2-24, 27-31)'.<sup>242</sup> However, although both texts use the same wordings **וְאֵלֵינוּ כֹּחַ**, it is doubtful whether each corresponding phrase describes God's 'transcendence'. First of all, Job's lamentation is because Job comes to know that he cannot win the dispute with God. Although Job's summon successfully makes God come into a courtroom setting and Job has opportunities to ask God about his misery, Job realises that he is not fit to address anything to God and no one can stand up against him (Job 9:2-4). He notices that the primary reason why he cannot get vindication from God is the divine power itself. God's mighty power in the context of Job 9:2-4 is in no way the object of praise and hope, but is the source of Job's personal depression. In this regard, the phrase in Job 9:4 (cf. 9:19) lays emphasis on the idea of the impossibility of arguing against God, rather than referring to the praise of God's omnipotence. On the other hand, the same wording in Isa 40:26 emerges in a different context, where God's mighty power turns up as reviving the vanished hope of Jacob-Israel. Deutero-Isaiah urges the exiles to take a look at the heavenly creatures and to see the Creator who knows and calls them by name, in order ultimately to redirect them to God's lordship over the Babylonian gods formed in astral cults. He stresses that God by his mighty power is controlling them without missing anything. The phrase **וְאֵלֵינוּ כֹּחַ** is then applied to the powerless and weak people (vv. 29, 31) to encourage their faith in God. Given that the message of Isa 40:26 is full of divine empowerment to recreate and to comfort the exiled community, Job's speeches in Job 9:4 convey in the same phrase deep grief for his plight.<sup>243</sup> Accordingly, although this phrase **וְאֵלֵינוּ כֹּחַ** is not commonplace in the Hebrew Bible,<sup>244</sup> the same wording conveys different nuances and meanings in each context.

---

<sup>242</sup> Terrien, "Quelques," 302.

<sup>243</sup> This verse might include indirectly sarcasm in terms of overwhelming power of God to humans. However, Job has no enmity against unjust God. I agree with Clines' comments; "we do not have here the bitter sarcasm that several commentators find (e.g., Fohrer, Hesse); Job's tone is that of the lament rather than the reproach.' See Clines, *Job 1-20*, 228.

<sup>244</sup> Note: a similar phrase (**חֲזָק וְאֵלֵינוּ כֹּחַ**; 'strong and mighty') is found in Isa 28:2a, Deut 31:7, 23; Josh 1:6-7, 9, 18; 1 Chr 22:13; 28:20.

### 2.2.2 'He who alone stretched out the heavens' (Job 9:8; Isa 44:24)

The second example is the unique phrase, נטה שמים לבדו ('who stretched out the heavens alone'),<sup>245</sup> which only appears in Job 9:8a and Isa 44:24 (with a small variation) within the Hebrew Bible; Robert Gordis for this particular expression argues that the poet of Job is directly quoting Isa 44:24.<sup>246</sup>

נטה שמים לבדו ודורך על-במתי ים

*He who alone stretched out the heavens and trod on the back of Yam (Job 9:8)*  
כה-אמר יהוה גאלך ויצרך מבטן אנכי יהוה עשה כל נטה שמים לבדי רקע הארץ (מי)  
(אתי) [מאתי]<sup>247</sup>

*Thus Yahweh—your redeemer and your shaper from the womb—says:  
'I am Yahweh, the Maker of all things, stretching out the heavens alone,  
treading the earth [by myself] (who is beside me?)' (Isa 44:24)*

From this parallel, Terrien argues that 'the juxtaposition of themes implicitly suggests the assimilation of the Israel's creation to the creation of the universe.'<sup>248</sup> However, a closer examination of each context informs us that both texts may not be simplified as the idea of 'creation'. As the phrase נטה שמים לבדו in Job 9:8a makes a parallelism with another reference to ים ודורך על-במתי (‘trampling sea waves’) in 9:8b, these two expressions are likely to present the imagery of God's creation in the form of a hymn of praise. However, this is designed to portray the works of God, not to hint at the creation of the world as a cosmogonic event. Further, Job's doxology to God's power is surrounded by his despairing lament, which presents his inability to dispute against God, and is placed in frustration, that he cannot win the argument against God (Job 9:2-4, 14-24).<sup>249</sup> In Isa 44:24 (cf. 40:22), we may suppose that the author describes the past creation event as using words such as 'shaping (יצר)', 'making (עשה)', 'stretching (נטה)', and 'treading (רקע)'. Yet, the primary concern is not with the creation of the

<sup>245</sup> Pfeiffer, "Dual," 203; Elliott, "Comparative," 196; Terrien, "Quelques," 302; Brinks, "Job," 412–3.

<sup>246</sup> Gordis, *Job*, 103.

<sup>247</sup> There are two choices מי אתי (K; 'who was with me?'; 1QIs<sup>a</sup> מיא אתי), 4QIs<sup>b</sup>, and Hebrew MSS; LXX, Aq, Vg) and מאתי (Q; 'by myself'; Tg, Syr). There is no reason to put an interrogative at the end of this sentence. So, the translation here uses Q in MT (Watts, 693; Goldingay 2, 9-10).

<sup>248</sup> Terrien, "Quelques," 302.

<sup>249</sup> Gray, *Job*, 190.

world, but with the recreation of Jacob-Israel. The phrase נָטָה שָׁמַיִם לְבָדִי is in the context of divine superiority over the present and future history of Babylon and Judah as a ‘Creator’ and ‘Ruler’ by overturning human oracles (v. 25) and by fulfilling the divine intention through Cyrus (vv. 26-28); in Isa 40:23 over ‘princes’ or ‘rulers’ and in Isa 44:25 over the ‘signs of liars’, ‘diviners’, or ‘wise men’. This corresponding phrase aims to articulate God’s creative power, which defeats political and religious enemies and restores his people without any aids; namely, its literary purpose is to describe Yahweh who empowers Israelites to recall the greatness of God’s power as restorer. Accordingly, in this same wording, Deutero-Isaiah moves to counter the negative view of the divine power found in Job 9:8a.

Such a divine action developed in Deutero-Isaiah similarly occurs in other poetic and prophetic texts with the phrase נָטָה שָׁמַיִם ‘to stretch out the heavens’ (2 Sam 22:10; Ps 18:19; 104:2; 144:5; Jer 10:12; 51:15; Zech 12:1; Isa 42:5; 45:12; 48:13; 51:13, 16).<sup>250</sup> Norman C. Habel holds that the formula ‘he who stretches out the heavens’ is associated with the prevailing *Chaoskampf* motif and ‘sacred tent traditions in Israel’.<sup>251</sup> So, there is little reason to consider the direct dependence between Job and Deutero-Isaiah with regard to this idiom.

### 2.2.3 ‘Beyond investigation’ (Job 9:10; Isa 40:28)

The third frequently cited parallel is the phrase אֵין חֶקֶר (‘beyond investigation’)<sup>252</sup> in Job 9:10 and Isa 40:28:

עֲשֵׂה גְדֻלּוֹת עַד־אֵין חֶקֶר וְנִפְלְאוֹת עַד־אֵין מִסְפֵּר

*It is he who does extraordinary things beyond investigation*

<sup>250</sup> Scholars (Gordis, 103; Tur-Sinai, 157) frequently mention in this verse the Babylonian Creation Epic, *Enuma elish* (tablet IV, 11. 137) to recall the similarity between texts: ‘He split her like a shellfish into two parts: half of her he set up and ceiled it as sky’ (ANET, 67). It shows that there was widespread knowledge of the creation narrative, not a direct quotation from foreign texts. This parallel cannot be suggested as unusual case of proving the distinctive relationship between Job and Deutero-Isaiah.

<sup>251</sup> See Norman C. Habel, “He Who Stretches out the Heavens,” *CBQ* 34, no. 4 (1972): 34.

<sup>252</sup> Pfeiffer, “Dual,” 203; Elliott, “Comparative,” 196; Terrien, “Quelques,” 303; Nurmela, *Mouth*, 8; Brinks, “Job,” 413; Kynes, “Job,” 101.

*and he who performs marvellous things beyond numbering. (Job 9:10)*

הָלוֹא יָדַעְתָּ אִם-לֹא שָׁמַעַתָּ אֱלֹהֵי עוֹלָם יְהוָה בּוֹרֵא קְצוֹת הָאָרֶץ לֹא יֵעָף וְלֹא יִיגַע אֵין חֶקֶר לְתַבּוּנָתוֹ

*Have you not known? Have you not listened?*

*Yahweh is the everlasting God, the creator of the ends of the earth.*

*He neither grows weary nor grows exhausted; his understanding is beyond investigation (Isa 40:28)*

This phrase in Job 9:10 is used for describing the mysterious works of God beyond human understanding (vv. 8-10) and in Isa 40:28b speaks of no limit to the understanding of Yahweh who gives strength to the faint and energy to the resourceless (Isa 40:29).<sup>253</sup> In this connection, Terrien notes that ‘the immeasurability of creative activity is employed by Job to affirm transcendence in the context of human impotence.’<sup>254</sup> However, the phrase in Job 9:10 is not used for praising God’s wonderful and unsearchable deeds (vv. 8-10; cf. Amos 5:8), but it aims at resisting God’s unjust treatment toward Job so much so that its tonality is discouraging and hopeless; ‘dismay’ (Clines) or probably ‘irony’ (Gordis). The marvellous power shown in the created world comes to be overwhelming for Job. So, the main reason for using this idiom is to speak indirectly against God who is not using his power in the right way. On the other hand, in Isa 40:28, this expression אֵין חֶקֶר is used for intensifying God’s limitless ‘understanding’ as the Creator, the eternal God who is fundamentally different from humans and other foreign gods. This is the declaration of who God is, delivered in a polemical tone toward Israel who complained that their ‘way’ (דֶּרֶךְ) is ‘hidden from Yahweh’ (נִסְתָּרָה מִיְהוָה) and their ‘justice (מִשְׁפָּט) is ignored (v. 27) by their God. Since the God of Israel is not an unresponsive deity disfiguring justice, but the Creator in time and space empowering the hopeless, the prophet confirms that the infinite divine wisdom positively works for the benefit of the exilic community. Thus, the immeasurable stature of God in Job 9:10 is the source of doubting the divine justice, of complaining about the hidden way of contending with God, and of despairing

---

<sup>253</sup> Verse 29a starts with a participial clause modifying “his understanding” in v. 28b. See Goldingay, *Isaiah vol. I*, 127–8.

<sup>254</sup> Terrien, “Quelques,” 303.

humans. However, the boundless wisdom in Deutero-Isaiah is the foundation of removing human doubt, of convincing Israel of the divine judgment, and of achieving divine empowerment for his people.

Furthermore, if other references relating to **אין חקר** are considered, the argument that there exists a distinctive literary connection between Job and Deutero-Isaiah via this word-pair would be unpersuasive. In the book of Job, Eliphaz in Job 5:9 already uttered the eight words in Job 9:10, although there are slight variants:

עשה גדלות ואין חקר נפלאות עד-אין מספר

*It is he who does extraordinary things unsearchable beyond investigation, who performs marvelous things beyond counting. (Job 5:9)*

This parallel between Job 5:9 and 9:10 is more remarkable than that with Deutero-Isaiah, and would imply that Job is ironically reusing Eliphaz's words.<sup>255</sup> Furthermore, other noteworthy references in the Hebrew Bible are found in Prov 25:3 and Ps 145:3; the expression **אין חקר** in Ps 145:3 definitely appears with God's salvific action in doxology form (Ps 145:19-20), and in Prov 25:3 refers to the 'unsearchable' heart of the king:

*Great is Yahweh, and the one to be greatly praised, and his greatness is beyond investigation (אין חקר). (Ps 145:3)*  
*As the heavens are for height, and the earth is for depth, the heart of kings is unsearchable (אין חקר). (Prov 25:3)*

#### 2.2.4 'What are you doing?' (Job 9:12; Isa 45:9)

The fourth phrase **מה-תעשה** ('what are you doing?') in Job 9:12 and Isa 45:9 has been regarded as evidence of a literary relationship:<sup>256</sup>

הן יחתף מי ישיבנו מי-יאמר אליו מה-תעשה

*If he carries off<sup>257</sup>, who can prevent him?*

---

<sup>255</sup> Here Eliphaz's words have the conventional form of doxology to encourage the innocent Job to seek God. This is quite admonitory (cf. 5:8, 17) and functions as rationalizing the divine justice against Job's claim. See Dhorme, *Job*, 133.

<sup>256</sup> Pfeiffer, "Dual," 204; Terrien, "Quelques," 303; Kynes, "Job," 101–2; Brinks, "Job," 413.

*Who will say to him; ‘What are you doing?’ (Job 9:12)*

הַיָּאֵמֵר חֹמֶר לִיצְרוֹ מִה־תַּעֲשֶׂה וּפְעֵלָךְ אֵין־יָדַיִם לוֹ

*Would the clay say to the one forming it: ‘what are you doing?’*

*Or would your work say: ‘he has no hands’? (Isa 45:9b)*

How does each context use these same wordings? To begin with, the phrase מִה־תַּעֲשֶׂה in Job 9:12a is employed to handle the impossibility of disturbing the divine action by which God allows Job’s personnel suffering; and especially in Job’s experience it underscores that he cannot bring God into the court and interrogate Him saying ‘what are you doing?’ On the contrary, Deutero-Isaiah, in a polemic statement, depicts the relationship of potter-pot, warning that a pot cannot teach its maker and should not forget that it is simply clay. In this analogy, the context in Isa 45:9-13 includes the argumentation of Yahweh against Israelites who points out their lack of faith and says that they have no right to contend with their Creator (v. 9a), to teach the Creator how he should manage the world (v. 9b), and to object to their birth and destiny (v. 10). In Isa 45:9, the God whom Israel protested against in their unbelief was not always a hidden deity as in Job (Isa 45:15; cf. 54:8), but he had spoken from the beginning (45:19; cf. 48:16) as the Shaper of Israel (45:11a) and the Creator of human history (45:12). Accordingly, the same wordings are not matched in each differing context.

Moreover, it would be better to suppose that the phrase מִה־תַּעֲשֶׂה is a conventional expression in the Hebrew Bible. For instance, there is the same expression from Elihu’s speech employed in Job 35:6 where it implies that Job’s increased sins are not able to affect God and His sovereign deed:

---

<sup>257</sup> Most commentators (Driver-Gray, Dhorme, Tur-Sinai, Good, Gray) render יִחַתֵּף as “to snatch away, break, slaughter” in connection with the verb חָטַף. However, Grabbe maintains that “the comparative philological evidence seems strong enough to keep the MT חָתַף (‘carry off’; hapax) without change”. In my opinion, it seems to be unnecessary to emend it into יִחַתֵּף since the verb root חָתַף, is found in the noun חָתָף in Prov 23:28 (cf. Eccl 15:14; 32:22; 50:4; Sir 15:14; 32:21; 50:4; 1QH 5:10). See Lester L. Grabbe, *Comparative Philology and the Text of Job: A Study in Methodology*, SBLDS 34 (Missoula, Montana: Scholars, 1977), 60–3; Walter Ludwig Michel, *Job in the Light of Northwest Semitic*, BO 42 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1987), 209–10; Clines, *Job 1-20*, 217.

*If you have sinned, what do you accomplish against him? And if your transgressions are multiplied, what do you do to him?* (מה־תַּעֲשֶׂה־לּוֹ) (Job 35:6)

This parallel with slight changes is also found in different passages of Prov 25:8 (to neighbours), Dan 4:32 (to God; מה עבדת), and Eccl 8:4 (to kings); cf. Sir 36:10.<sup>258</sup> In addition to this, another literary connection, ‘who can turn him (it) back’ between Job 9:12 (מִי יְשִׁיבֵנוּ) and Isa 43:13 (וְמִי יְשִׁיבֵנָה; slightly different) is a good example that indicates that the parallel words are no more than a well-known expression (cf. Job 11:10; 23:13; Isa 14:27; Jer 2:24).

## 2.2.5 ‘The hand of Yahweh has done this’ (Job 12:9; Isa 41:20)

Finally, another cited verbal connection is כִּי יַד־יְהוָה עָשְׂתָה זֹאת (‘the hand of Yahweh has done this’) in Job 12:9 and Isa 41:20:<sup>259</sup>

מִי לֹא־יָדַע בְּכָל־אֱלֹהִים כִּי יַד־יְהוָה עָשְׂתָה זֹאת  
*Who among all these does not know that the hand of Yahweh<sup>260</sup> has done this?*  
(Job 12:9)

לְמַעַן יֵרְאוּ וַיֵּדְעוּ וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ וַיִּשְׁכַּלּוּ יַחְדָּו כִּי יַד־יְהוָה עָשְׂתָה זֹאת וְקֹדֶשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּרָאָהּ  
*So that they may see and know, may consider and understand together that the hand of Yahweh has done this and that the Holy One of Israel has created it.* (Isa 41:20)

This unique parallel might affirm the particular correlation between the two books, but there is at least one missing step in this argument. The idiomatic expression appears in Job’s dialogue in which Job challenges his friends to test what is the knowledge which the natural world of

---

<sup>258</sup> Hartley, *Job*, 173; Clines, *Job 1-20*, 232–3.

<sup>259</sup> Gordis, *Job*, 138; Nurmela, *Mouth*, 12–3; Brinks, “Job,” 414.

<sup>260</sup> Throughout the entire dialogue, the divine name יְהוָה is employed only here and the alternative name, אֱלֹהִים, instead of “Yahweh” in MT is found in five other Hebrew manuscripts (“three MSS of Kennicott and two of de Rossi”). So, some commentators have believed that the original version had אֱלֹהִים. (Pope, Dhorme). Dhorme (also Duhm, Gray) claims that the author of Job altered the name אֱלֹהִים to יְהוָה from the reference of Isa 41:20. See Dhorme, *Job*, 173–4; Gray, *Job*, 217. But, Gordis treats it as unconscious usage, and Clines similarly argues that “the hand of Yahweh” was “not an accidental intrusion” as it is a well-known idiom prevalent in the Old Testament (over thirty occurrences); but he agrees that that there could be the possibility of “scribal slip” (also Newsom). See Gordis, *Job*, 138; Clines, *Job 1-20*, 295; Newsom, “Job,” 428. In my opinion, it is impossible to determine, with the same verbal connection only, whether there was intentional literary dependence on Isa 41:20 or it was a scribal slip, but this word seems to be a late revision.



‘animals’, ‘birds’, ‘earth’, and ‘fish’ possesses (12:7-8): ‘Ask the animals and they will teach you’ (12:7a). The literary form in Job 12:7-9 is generally considered as ‘wisdom instruction’ or ‘satire’<sup>261</sup> on the traditional doctrines in which his friends have believed.<sup>262</sup> The relevant question about the context of the formulation is: ‘What is the knowledge that even the natural world itself, but not humans, can perceive?’ What is ambiguous in the given context is the precise reference of the pronoun **זֶה**; because the pronoun may refer to God’s immeasurable wisdom (11:7-9), to the just governance of the world (11:10-11) (pointing back to Zophar’s speech), to Job’s innocence and the injustice of the real world which Job lamented (12:4-6), or to the simple fact that creatures are governed by God (12:10).

In the given context, on the one hand, such a natural knowledge of creation is the elementary knowledge concerning the world order in creation and the retributive principle in the world which Job has already known very well (Job 12:2-3). On the other hand, what the pronoun means is the abnormal and aggressive act of God without any reason.<sup>263</sup> In my view, the latter better fits in the present context than the former; though both implications could work in the present context. Because of what Yahweh’s hand has done, not his own wrongdoings, the innocent Job has become a ‘laughingstock’ to his friends (v. 4) and has been condemned by oppressors (v. 5) and because of God’s wrong judgment, the wicked are in peace and secure (v.6). The elementary information of all the created things shown in Job 12:7-9 can say nothing but the truth that, behind every work in the world, God exists. It might be the well-arranged created order that his friends understood, but it is not the real knowledge of how it works. In

---

<sup>261</sup> Dell regards vv. 7-9 as being a misused “traditional form of praise to God as creator” to declare God’s glory in Psalm (cf. Ps 98:7-9). See Dell, *Sceptical*, 126–8.

<sup>262</sup> Job 12:7-8 according to Gordis is an “oblique restatement” “of Job about friends’ admonition. See Robert Gordis, “Quotations as a Literary Usage in Biblical, Oriental and Rabbinic Literature,” *HUCA* 22 (1949): 214–5; Clines, *Job 1-20*, 292–3.

<sup>263</sup> With reference to the pronoun “this”, Newsome says that “all that one needs to know, Job suggests, is that God is ultimately responsible.” See Newsom, “Job,” 428. Clines notes that it is “the willful act of a malign deity”. See Clines, *Job 1-20*, 294.

this rhetorical question, it indicates that the superficial judgment of his friends upon Job is no more than a conventional sort of cliché (v. 12) and ultimately fails to resolve Job's dilemma and to reflect how God governs the world. Consequently, the phrase **כִּי יִדְּיָהוּהָ עָשָׂתָה זֶאת** here serves to undermine his friends' flawed doctrine of God's omnipotence and implies that God's unresponsive injustice is behind Job's suffering.

Next, let us see the context which the same wordings have in Isa 41:20. It is supposed that the passage Isa 41:17-20 typically consists of the direct proclamation of Yahweh which addresses for the prophet and humans what God will do for the protection and security of His people. It is given in the response to the desperate cry of the afflicted including the Israelite community, providing God's answer and promise that 'I the God of Israel will never forsake them' (41:17b). Yahweh's announcement of the community's renewing and of the oppression's end is described in metaphors of the transformation of the land; the watering of the desert (v. 18) and the re-animation of seven wilderness plants (v. 19). The great transformation comes as the means of the new creation, and in the miraculous rehabilitation of nature, which comes along with the transformation of human destiny, God's action is anticipated for the participants to perceive<sup>264</sup> the work of Yahweh's hand and to receive the God of Israel as the Restorer and Creator for the destiny of humans (41:20). Accordingly, the pronoun **זֶאת** in Deutero-Isaiah is not linked with the pessimistic view of the unbalanced judgment of God as Job said, but definitely implies the final renewing and restoring act of Yahweh for the exiles who were in doubt and fear. The common expression, therefore, means something entirely different in the two contexts.

Furthermore, the additional reason for denying the literary relationship is that this is used as a common idiomatic phrase in other places in the Hebrew Bible. Dhorme notices that although there are parallel wordings between them, the author of Job echoes 'truths universally known

---

<sup>264</sup> In four Hebrew verbs: 'seeing' (**יָרָא**), 'knowing' (**יָדַעַ**), 'considering' (**וַיִּשְׁמַר**), and 'understanding' (**וַיִּשְׁכִּיל**).

and forming an integral part of current literature<sup>265</sup> as presenting links with Ps 109:27, Isa 66:2, and Jer 14:22b; in particular Ps 109:27 is likely to be a well-known expression in Israel which possibly dates from a pre-exilic period.<sup>266</sup> Indeed, since the origin of the phrase ‘the hand of Yahweh’ has multiple sources in other biblical materials,<sup>267</sup> the linguistic similarity may not show the association between the two books.

### 2.2.6 Summary

The most often cited links between Job (Job 9:4, 8, 10, 12; 12:9) and Deutero-Isaiah (Isa 40:26, 28; 41:20; 44:24; 45:9) have been supposed to sustain the relationship between the two books. Terrien, as discussed above, argues that the motif of the ‘divine transcendence’ is obviously concentrated in verbal parallels in Job 9-10 and Deutero-Isaiah.<sup>268</sup> However, before assuming the distinctive association between Job and Deutero-Isaiah, the whole literary context should be compared, and what we have found out is that they are used with different literary meanings and for different theological purposes. The literary purpose of the same wordings in Job 9 and 12 is to represent the impossibility of disputing with God and to speak of his incomprehensible divinity, while, in Deutero-Isaiah’s linked verses, the author gives a reliable and immediate answer to the doubts and questions of Israel with regard to God’s power and justice, to correct their unbelief and to reassure the hearers. Thus, by simple overlapped wordings, no one may validly address the existence of the literary association between the two books.

### 2.3 Conclusion

A Jewish scholar, Samuel Sandmel, addresses the danger of assuming that passages, which are parallel in a literary sense, also have an historical association. He calls this phenomenon of

---

<sup>265</sup> Dhorme, *Job*, 173–4.

<sup>266</sup> Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Psalms 60-150: A Commentary* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989), 922; Leslie C. Allen, *Psalms 101-150*, WBC 21 (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2002), 76.

<sup>267</sup> J. J. M. Roberts, “The Hand of Yahweh,” *VT* 21, no. 2 (1971): 244–51.

<sup>268</sup> Terrien, “Quelques,” 301.

over-generalization, of determining the literary influence in a particular direction, *parallelomania*, and defines this ‘as that extravagance among scholars which first overdoes the supposed similarity in passages and then proceeds to describe source and derivation as if implying literary connections flowing in an inevitable or predetermined direction.’<sup>269</sup> As an example, Sandmel states that the relationship between the Pauline epistles and the rabbis, although there are no less than 259 parallels between them, is not ‘in thorough agreement’ and shows ‘attitudes and conclusions about the Torah that are diametrically opposed’.<sup>270</sup> Likewise, such an overemphasis may be found in the claim about the interrelationship between Job and Deutero-Isaiah. However, verbal resemblances may be explained not by literary dependence/influence, but by a common reflection of broader cultural phenomena on which both writers might possibly draw, so that we need to evaluate these links very carefully. No matter how many parallels between texts are produced, unless there are distinguishing and unique analogies, none of them definitely could demonstrate a literary relationship; though reading our texts in the framework of those subject-matters is useful in some contexts.

---

<sup>269</sup> Samuel Sandmel, “Parallelomania,” *JBL* 81, no. 1 (1962): 1.

<sup>270</sup> *Ibid.*, 4.

### Chapter 3 Job and Deutero-Isaiah in the Hebrew Bible

The main task until now has been to demonstrate that comparative studies between Job and Deutero-Isaiah lack sufficient evidence to show a genuine correspondence. Now, in order to strengthen the foregoing argument, I will explore interconnections between Job/Deutero-Isaiah and other biblical literatures. On the one hand, numerous verbal parallels and thematic affinities between the book of Job and the Hebrew Bible have been proposed by biblical scholars so far, and many recent works introduce an intertextual study in this domain.<sup>271</sup> On the other hand, Deutero-Isaiah exhibits strong and clearly-marked affinities with other biblical texts, and a variety of textual associations has been examined by commentators;<sup>272</sup> comparative studies of the relationship between Deutero-Isaiah and other texts have recently been undertaken by Patricia Tull Willey, Benjamin Sommer, and Risto Nurmela.<sup>273</sup> Here, for our task, I will present several examples of remarkable parallels between Job/Deutero-Isaiah and other texts, because it is hardly feasible to address all the potential resemblances observed in each relationship, in this

---

<sup>271</sup> Cheyne, *Job*, 83–9; Tur-Sinai, *Job*, lxiv–lxix; Dhorme, *Job*, clii–clxxiv; Hartley, *Job*, 11–3. For the intertextual studies in the Hebrew Bible, Katharine J. Dell and Will Kynes, eds., *Reading Job Intertextually*, LHB/OTS 574 (NY: T&T Clark, 2013); Thomas Krüger et al., eds., *Das Buch Hiob Und Seine Interpretationen: Beiträge Zum Hiob-Symposium Auf Dem Monte Verità Vom 14.-19. August 2005*, ATANT (Zürich: TVZ, 2007); Stephen L. Cook et al., eds., *The Whirlwind: Essays on Job, Hermeneutics and Theology in Memory of Jane Morse*, JSOT 336 (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001).

<sup>272</sup> Cheyne, *Prophecies*, 2:241–58; Umberto Cassuto, “On the Formal and Stylistic Relationship between Deutero-Isaiah and Other Biblical Writers,” in *Biblical and Oriental Studies*, Publications of the Perry Foundation for Biblical Research in the Hebrew University of Jerusalem (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1973), 141–77.

<sup>273</sup> Willey interprets similarities with other biblical texts by broad literary reference in verbal links rather than contextual background and tone, but Sommer examines them and more cautiously adopts “allusion”. But, what they miss is that they do not include intertextual links with the book of Job and this is because they believe that the writing of Deutero-Isaiah predates the book of Job. In particular, Willey only focuses on selected Deutero-Isaiah’s passages: Isa 51:9-52:12 (Nahum, Psalm, Lamentations, Pentateuch, Jeremiah); Isa 49:1-50:3 (Lam, Jeremiah); Isa 50:4-11; 52:13-53:12 (Lamentations); Isa 54:1-17 (Psalms; Pentateuch, Jeremiah, Lamentations). See Patricia Tull Willey, *Remember the Former Things: The Recollection of Previous Texts in Second Isaiah*, SBLDS 161 (Atlanta: SBL, 1997); Sommer, *Prophet*. Recently, Nurmela, *Mouth*.

limited space; I will not evaluate all the scholarly views about the literary reference, nor give detailed judgments, but I will give my personal views and impressions in a number of cases.<sup>274</sup> In addition, because of this extensive coverage of the textual links, the examination will be of necessity cursory. However, this is an indispensable part in the current debate to investigate the distinctive relationship between Job and Deutero-Isaiah.

After looking at a set of textual links, the key issue is to determine whether the claim of distinctive relationship between Job and Deutero-Isaiah is justified. The question—‘Does the relationship between the two books have unique characteristics which differ from the relationship between the two books and other biblical materials?’—is rarely asked by biblical scholars. So, this examination through textual links in the broader corpus would be method of determining the literary relationship of Job and Deutero-Isaiah. If the resemblance between the two books is commonplace when compared with other relationships, even though there are some remarkable connections between the two books, the distinctiveness of the relationship would be very limited.

### 3.1 *Pentateuchal and Deuteronomistic Texts*

#### 3.1.1 Job and Pentateuchal/Deuteronomistic Texts

Let us start by looking at resemblances between Job and the Pentateuch/deuteronomistic texts. Firstly, it has been thought that Job’s texts have a close relationship with the Pentateuch<sup>275</sup> and with the priestly tradition. By this, interpreters have argued that the author of Job critically used

---

<sup>274</sup> In a nutshell, what these copious interconnections suggest, as I suppose, is that there is not much likelihood that the authors of Job and Isa 40-55 already knew all the earlier sources and referred to them in their writings.

<sup>275</sup> Tur-Sinai maintains that the story of Job is “the running commentary” on the Pentateuch stories and that “the author of the poem regarded Job as a contemporary of Moses.” See Tur-Sinai, *Job*, lxiv–lxv.

and reformulated the contents in such materials.<sup>276</sup> An affinity is found in the phrase where the epilogue of Job comes to an end with these words, וַיָּמָת אִיּוֹב זָקֵן וְשֹׁבֵעַ יָמִים (Job 42:17), similar to the record of the death of Abraham and Isaac found in the priestly documents (Gen 25:8; 35:29);<sup>277</sup> also, Job is compared to the figure of Jacob in the patriarchal narrative, in that the word הָאָדָם appears in these two characters (Job 1:1, 8; 2:3; Gen 25:27).<sup>278</sup> More interestingly, many have mentioned similar patterns between the creation account in Gen 1:1-2:3 and the soliloquy of Job cursing the day of his birth in Job 3.<sup>279</sup> It has been maintained that Job's author used the idea of God's creation during seven days in Gen 1 (vv. 3, 7, 2, 14, 21, 15) to reapply them into Job's seven curses in Job 3 (vv. 3, 4, 5, 6-7, 8, 9, 15) in which Job nullifies all hope and laments his fate (cf. Jer 20:14-18).<sup>280</sup>

Interpreters have attributed verbal parallels and possible connections between Job and the priestly documents to the intentional usage of the author of Job. For instance, William Green claims that the book of Job supplies a better way of adapting the covenantal relationship to the reality of individuals while accepting the central ideas of Judaism—'monotheism', 'covenant',

---

<sup>276</sup> See Konrad Schmid, "Innerbiblische Schriftdiskussion Im Hiobbuch," in *Das Buch Hiob Und Seine Interpretationen: Beiträge Zum Hiob-Symposium Auf Dem Monte Verità Vom 14.-19. August 2005*, ATANT (Zürich: TVZ, 2007), 241–61; "The Authors of Job and Their Historical and Social Setting," in *Scribes, Sages, and Seers*, ed. Leo G. Perdue, FRLANT Heft. 219 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008), 145–53; Samuel E. Balentine, "Job as Priest to the Priests," *Ex Auditu* 18 (2002): 29–52; "Job and the Priests: 'He Leads Priests Away Stripped' (Job 12:19)," in *Reading Job Intertextually* (NY: T&T Clark, 2013), 42–53; William Scott Green, "Stretching the Covenant: Job and Judaism," *RE* 99, no. 4 (2002): 569–77; Israel Knohl, *The Divine Symphony: The Bible's Many Voices* (Philadelphia: JPS, 2003); *The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School* (IN: Eisenbrauns, 2007). For the connection with Leviticus, see Mary Douglas, *Leviticus as Literature* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999).

<sup>277</sup> Schmid, "Innerbiblische," 247–8.

<sup>278</sup> Ellen F. Davis, "Job and Jacob: The Integrity of Faith," in *The Whirlwind*, JSOT 336 (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 100–120.

<sup>279</sup> Fishbane, "Jeremiah"; Schmid, "Innerbiblische," 244–5; Balentine, "Priests," 47–8.

<sup>280</sup> Balentine, "Priests," 47–8. The pattern of Job 3:1-13 has the "counter-cosmic incantation", a reversal of the creation description in Gen 1-2:4a. Refer to Fishbane, "Jeremiah," 153–4.

and ‘cult’.<sup>281</sup> The book of Job, according to Green, presents ‘a fuller theological context for Leviticus’ and widely adapts ‘the structure of levitical religion’.<sup>282</sup> Konrad Schmid similarly maintains that Job ‘presents a critical evaluation of the theocratic order of the Priestly Order which must be considered one of the fundamental theological tenets of priestly thinking’.<sup>283</sup> Israel Knohl, as another example, seeing Job as the figure having the most dignified faith among non-Israelites, argues that the shift of faith from ‘the fear of the Lord’, which the pious Job possessed, to ‘the religious insight’ after Yahweh disclosed himself out of the tempest in Job 38:1, is similar to the dynamic change in the priestly Torah where the faith moves from Moses to Israel.<sup>284</sup> Especially noteworthy is the fact that there are the differences about the role of humans in the word between Job and the Priestly Torah; in the Priestly Torah and Job’s initial knowledge, humans are the centre of the world, while Yahweh’s speech in Job does not exalt humans as the apex of all the creatures; probably, it might be said that the theology of Genesis is critically evaluated by Job. However, it is likely to be an excessive interpretation to equate the process of ‘the refinement of an individual’s faith-consciousness’ in Job with ‘that which takes place on a national scale in the Priestly Torah’ from the Genesis period to the period of Moses and Israel.<sup>285</sup>

On the contrary, Samuel Balentine doubts if the author of Job is critically engaging with the Priestly traditions. Instead, in association with the priestly languages in Job (Gen 1:1-2:4a; Exod 25-31; 35-40; Num 1-10; 26-36; cf. also Ezekiel, Leviticus), Balentine claims that the author intended to criticise the diminishing efficacy of the priestly group (Job 12:17-21); the author of Job (e.g., Job 12:19) obliquely reflects the historical context where priests were

---

<sup>281</sup> “Job provides a fuller theological context for Leviticus than Leviticus provides for itself”; Green, “Stretching,” 577.

<sup>282</sup> Ibid., 577.

<sup>283</sup> Schmid, “The Authors of Job,” 151.

<sup>284</sup> See Knohl, *Sanctuary*, 165–7; *Symphony*, 115–22.

<sup>285</sup> Knohl, *Symphony*, 119.



banished, thrown away by God, and protests at such a removal of priests.<sup>286</sup> According to him, there are possible connections between the priestly materials and the prologue of Job such as ‘blameless’ Job (תם; Job 1:1), ‘burnt offering’ (עלֹות; Job 1:5; 42:8; Gen 8:20; 22:2, etc.), rituals of ‘mourning’ (Job 1:20; 2:7, 12; Isa 15:2; 22:12; Jer 7:7:29; 16:6; Ezek 7:18; Amos 8:10; Mic 1:16), and ‘loathsome sores’ (שִׁחִיךְ; Job 2:7; Lev 13:18-23).<sup>287</sup> For another example with the book of Genesis, the creation account of the Garden of Eden from Gen 1:1-2:4a is compared with the figure of a ‘priestly Job’, taking ‘the land of Uz’ (Job 1:1, 3) as a geographical background in the prologue and epilogue (Job 1-2; 42:7-17).<sup>288</sup> His claim, that ‘the question of the chronological relationship between Job and the Priestly traditions must remain open’,<sup>289</sup> is notable, but it would be difficult to read the book of Job in the historical context of the priestly system and rituals.

Secondly, Deuteronomy and the entire deuteronomistic texts have produced a variety of literary resemblances with the book of Job.<sup>290</sup> Edward Greenstein maintains that Job refers to a dozen passages from the Song of Moses in Deut 32, and parodies them as a source of conventional

---

<sup>286</sup> In conclusion, Balentine claims that “the ‘priestly’ Job in the Prologue-Epilogue seems resolutely committed to the efficacy of the sacrifices, prayers, and rituals that defines religious behaviour from a cultic perspective.” See Balentine, “Priests”. Also, see “Job as Priests.”

<sup>287</sup> Balentine, “Priests,” 49–51.

<sup>288</sup> Meier and Balentine treat the prologue of Job as echoing the prologue of Genesis: six narrative scenes in heaven and earth; the use of the Hebrew verb בָּרַךְ (‘bless’) (Gen 2:3; Job 1:5, 11, 11, 21; 2:5, 9; 42:12). Sam Meier, “Job 1-2: A Reflection of Genesis 1-3,” *VT* 39, no. 2 (1989): 184–90; Balentine, “Priests,” 45–6.

<sup>289</sup> Balentine, “Priests,” 44.

<sup>290</sup> Georg Braulik, “Das Deuteronomium Und Die Bucher Ijob, Sprichwörter, Rut: Zur Frage Friiher Kanonizität Des Deuteronomiums,” in *Die Tora Als Kanon Für Juden Und Christen*, ed. Erich Zenger, Herders biblische Studien (Freiburg im Br: Herder, 1996), 70–90; Manfred Oeming, “Hiob Monolog-Der Weg Nach Innen,” in *Hiobs Weg: Stationen von Menschen Im Leid*, ed. Manfred Oeming and Konrad Schmid (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2001), 57–75; Markus Witte, “Does the Torah Keep Its Promise? Job’s Critical Intertextual Dialogue with Deuteronomy,” in *Reading Job Intertextually* (NY: T&T Clark, 2013), 54–65; Manfred Oeming, “Hiob 31 Und Der Dekalog,” in *The Book of Job*, ed. W. A. M. Beuken, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium (Louvain: Peeters, 1994), 362–68; Schmid, “Innerbiblische.”

wisdom thought (Job 38:7, Deut 32:43a; Job 29:6, Deut 32:13b-14a).<sup>291</sup> He argues the parody of Deut 32 on Job as a later source, although saying ‘the term “influence” is also clearly inappropriate’ and ‘theoretically, neither the Song of Moses nor the book of Job has priority’.<sup>292</sup> He points out the noteworthy word-pair which only appears in the Song of Moses (Deut 32:4) and in Job’s prologue (Job 1:1, 8; 2:3): תָּמַ (‘whole’, ‘integrity’), יָשָׁר (‘straight’, ‘upright’),<sup>293</sup> and then draws a conclusion, that ‘the God who would do only justice in the Song of Moses is refigured in the book of Job as a man who has suffered intolerable divine injustice and who is himself absolutely committed to doing and speaking the right’.<sup>294</sup>

In recent researches, some have affirmed that ideas which are featured in Job’s prose tale—Job’s piety and blessings (Job 1:2-3, 10; Deut 28:12; 30:9), Job’s disease (Job 2:7b; Deut 28:35), and Job’s double reimbursement according to the law (Job 42:10; Deut 30:3cf. Exod 22:3, 8)—contain critical views on the Deuteronomistic theology.<sup>295</sup> Raik Heckl recommends parallel readings between Samuel-Kings and Job, by comparing Job’s loss and restoration with the death of the Elides (1 Sam 1-4) and the change of the exiles’ fate (Deut 30:3); e.g., motifs of interceding for someone (1 Sam 2:25a; Job 42:7-9) and cursing against God, and of children’s sudden deaths (Job 1:5; 2:9; 1 Sam 1:11; 2:9b; 3:13) between Job and 1 Sam 1-4.<sup>296</sup> According to Heckl, the thematic formula described in the restoration of Job—וַיְהִי וְשָׁב אֶת-שְׁבִית אִיּוֹב (‘Yahweh restored the fortunes of Job’) in Job 42:10—is found in the narrative concerning the

---

<sup>291</sup> Edward L. Greenstein, “Parody as a Challenge to Tradition: The Use of Deuteronomy 32 in the Book of Job,” in *Reading Job Intertextually* (NY: T&T Clark, 2013), 66–78.

<sup>292</sup> Ibid., 69.

<sup>293</sup> Ibid., 77.

<sup>294</sup> Ibid., 77.

<sup>295</sup> Refer to Witte, “Torah,” 63–4; Raik Heckl, *Hiob -- Vom Gottesfürchtigen Zum Repräsentanten Israels: Studien Zur Buchwerdung Des Hiobbuches Und Zu Seinen Quellen*, FAT (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 263–72; Schmid, “Innerbiblische,” 251–2.

<sup>296</sup> Raik Heckl, “The Relationship between Job 1-2, 42 and 1 Samuel 1-4,” in *Reading Job Intertextually* (NY: T&T Clark, 2013), 81–93.

restoration of Jehoiachin in 2 Kgs 25:27-30.<sup>297</sup> Further, Heckl, seeing Job as ‘a representative of Israel in suffering’ in the postexilic period, conclusively asserts that ‘Job’s theology of history is not only critically directed against deuteronomism, but it also opens new perspectives: the restoration of Job who represents Israel follows the reconciliation between God and the pagan world, represented by Job’s friends.’<sup>298</sup> Heckl’s view, Job’s critical reception of deuteronomism, would be helpful to compare both texts, but his argument is based on inappropriate analogy by equating Job with Israel, and Job’s friends with pagans, and the claim that ‘an older independent Job study never existed’<sup>299</sup> is hardly acceptable.

For another example, Georg Braulik argues that wordings in Job 24:1-17 are related to the language of the book of Deuteronomy and Exod 20, and especially that Job 24:14-16 is correlated with the Decalogue (Deut 5:17-19; 22:22, 26) and Exod 20:13-15.<sup>300</sup> Manfred Oeming and Markus Witte, what is more, hold that Job’s moral behaviour presented in the form of the ‘oath of purgation’ in Job 31 closely corresponds to the thought of the Decalogue and to Deuteronomy’s theology.<sup>301</sup> In a slightly different approach, Witte, however, supports ‘a structural intertextuality’ rather than a direct literary dependence between Job and Deuteronomy, and attempts to indicate ‘how Deuteronomy is repeatedly alluded to in the multiple redactional layers of Job as the book developed’.<sup>302</sup> For example, Job’s references to תו (‘mark’) and ספר (‘book’) in Job 31:35 are interpreted as ‘a cipher for the Torah authored by

---

<sup>297</sup> Ibid., 87–8. The character of Job depends on the exemplary pious figures in 1 Samuel and Jewish literary traditions such as Eli, Samuel, and Hannah. Heckl supposes that “an older independent Job story never existed” (p. 86). The structure of the prose tale is influenced by deuteronomistic theology and mainly supports a critical stance against Job’s friends’ theology; the fact that Job’s prayer for his friends as representatives of the pagan world is followed by the restoration of Job can refer to the Jewish eschatological hope and salvation for Israel and pagan nations. He says that “the canonical book of Job is therefore a witness to the critical reception and interpretation of deuteronomistic theology” (p. 89).

<sup>298</sup> Ibid., 89.

<sup>299</sup> Ibid., 86.

<sup>300</sup> Braulik, “Das Deuteronomium,” 70–90.

<sup>301</sup> Oeming, “Hiob 31”; “Hiob Monolog”; Witte, “Torah,” 57–60.

<sup>302</sup> Witte, “Torah,” 55.

God' and "these signs" from the Torah stand 'as an analogy for the first commandment (Deut 5:6-7)'.<sup>303</sup> Furthermore, Witte argues that the author of Job, from the word **יְהוָה** ('the only One') in Job 23:13, 31:15 and Deut 6:4, makes the figure of Job look like the righteous one 'as a witness to the *Shema Israel*'.<sup>304</sup> I think that a broad influence of the deuteronomistic texts on Job is more probable than the direct allusion or quotation from Deutero-Isaiah. I agree with Witte's conclusion, that Job shows 'a sharp challenge of the deuteronomic theology of the justice of God', and 'may be read as a critical commentary on Deuteronomy and on its foundation of the righteousness of God and humanity'.<sup>305</sup>

### 3.1.2 Deutero-Isaiah and Pentateuchal/Deuteronomistic Texts

Likewise, Deutero-Isaiah has constantly been interpreted in relation to the Pentateuch and the deuteronomistic texts. In the first place, what is commonly acknowledged is that the Pentateuch contains many 'typological' connections with Deutero-Isaiah. The most prominent typology between the two books, although it is not always accepted, has been made from the theme of a new exodus, echoing passages in the Exodus tradition, where the *Heilsgeschichte* of Israel which is extended from the patriarchal period to the entry into the Promised Land shapes

---

<sup>303</sup> Ibid., 58.

<sup>304</sup> Ibid., 58. Witte also proposes conceptual connections, "suggesting an intended contention with Deut 32 by the poets standing behind Job 31"—(1) "the salutation of the earth" (Deut 32:1//Job 31:38-40); (2) "the motif of devouring fire" (Deut 32:22//Job 31:12); (3) **פִּלְיָל**, "judge" (Deut 32:31//Job 31:11, 28)—and other thematic similarities such as an encounter with God (Deut 5:4, 22//Job 31:35-37), "social ethics" (Deut 10:17-19a//Job 31:14) (p. 58-9). And Eliphaz's admonition is an attempt to put the Torah into Job's mind (Job 22:22) and Yahweh's speech from the storm (Job 38-39) is understood as the verification of Job's petition to the Torah. In Elihu's speeches, Elihu is "understood as an interpretation of the *Shema Israel*" (Deut 32:39) (p. 64). Witte's claims concerning the relationship between Job and Deuteronomy are that the faithful obedience to the Torah will ultimately lead to the successful life although the deuteronomic idea of justice is criticized by Job's poet. The book of Job is thoroughly connected with the teachings of the Decalogue or the Torah and figures of Job and Elihu are suggested as faithful witnesses of Torah.

<sup>305</sup> Ibid., 65. Similarly, for the critical view of Job on Deuteronomistic theology, see Schmid, "The Authors of Job."

Deutero-Isaiah's eschatological vision.<sup>306</sup> Fishbane notices the typological expression of 'the exodus *traditum*' in Isa 43:21a, as referring to Israelites who declare their praise to Yahweh—'the people whom (עַם־זִוִּי) I formed for myself'—reminiscent of the delivered Israel in the Song of Sea in Exod 15:13, 16 ('the people whom (עַם־זִוִּי) you have redeemed/purchased').<sup>307</sup> Another expression shared with the exodus story is the phrase לֹא בַחֲפָזוֹן ('not in haste') in Isa 52:12, Exod 12:11, 31, and Deut 16:3<sup>308</sup> where the migration from Babylon across the wilderness in Isa 52:11-12 resembles the Israelites' marching orders during their journey in the desert of the Exodus:

סורו סורו צאו משם טמא אל־תגעו  
צאו מתוכה הברו נשאי כלי יהוה  
כי לא בחפזון תצאו ובמנוסה לא תלכו  
כי־הלך לפניכם יהוה ומאספכם אלהי ישראל

*Turn, turn away, go out from there, do not touch unclean things; go out from the midst of her; purify yourselves; you who bear the vessels of Yahweh; because you will not go out in haste, and you will not leave in flight; because Yahweh will march before you and the God of Israel will be your rear guard. (Isa 52:11-12)*

Also, the visibility of Yahweh (כִּי עֵין בְּעֵין יֵרָאוּ, 'for eye to eye they see') among exiles in Isa 52:8 (cf. Lam 4:17; Ps 98:8) may be connected to Num 14:14 (אֲשֶׁר־עֵין בְּעֵין נִרְאָה, 'seen face to face') which describes Yahweh's theophany in the pillar of cloud and fire.

---

<sup>306</sup> For the relationship between the pentateuchal Exodus motif and Deutero-Isaiah, see Willey, *Remember*, 28–32; Merwe, *Pentateuchtradisies in Die Prediking van Deuterojsaja*; Walther Zimmerli, "Der 'Neue Exodus' in Der Verkündigung Der Beiden Grossen Exilspropheten," in *Gottes Offenbarung: Gesammelte Aufsätze Zum Alten Testament*, Theologische Bücherei Bd. 19 (München: C. Kaiser, 1963), 192–204; Bernhard W. Anderson, "Exodus Typology in Second Isaiah," in *Israel's Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honour of James Muilenburg*, ed. Bernhard W. Anderson and Walter J. Harrelson (London: SCM, 1962), 177–95; "Exodus and Covenant in Second Isaiah and Prophetic Tradition," in *Magnalia Dei, the Mighty Acts of God: Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Memory of G. Ernest Wright*, ed. Frank Moore Cross, Werner E. Lemke, and Patrick D. Miller (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976), 339–60; Dale Patrick, "Epiphanic Imagery in Second Isaiah's Portrayal of a New Exodus," *HAR* 8 (1984): 125–41; Fishbane, *Text and Texture*, 121–40.

<sup>307</sup> Another allusion appears in the imagery "streams of water" in the desert (Exod 17:3–6; Isa 43:20; 48:20–1); Fishbane, *Biblical*, 364.

<sup>308</sup> The reversal reuse ("not in haste you will go out") in Isa 52:12a is a unique case of Deutero-Isaiah and the Hebrew word, חֲפָזוֹן, which is only found otherwise in Exod 12:11 and Deut 16:3. Willey, *Remember*, 133–4.

There are other typological resemblances between Pentateuchal sources and Deutero-Isaiah: Moses and Cyrus (Isa 44:24-45:13; Exod 6-8);<sup>309</sup> Noah's flood (Isa 54:9-10; 44:27; 50:2; 51:10; 55:10-13; Gen 6:9-9:17);<sup>310</sup> Abraham and Cyrus (Isa 41:2-3; Gen 14);<sup>311</sup> Moses and the Suffering Servant;<sup>312</sup> the exiled Israelite and Jacob (Isa 43:22-28; Gen 30-32).<sup>313</sup> Among these typologies, there are three notable examples. The imagery of the 'barren one' in Isa 54:1 (עֲקֵרָה) (לֹא יִלְלֶדָה) (cf. Isa 51:2) would recall the childlessness of Sarah in Gen 11:30 (עֲקֵרָה) and of Samson's mother in Judg 13:2-3 (עֲקֵרָה וְלֹא יִלְדָּתָה);<sup>314</sup> in this imagery, the later blessing to Abraham and Sarah might be involved in the coming fertility of forsaken Judahite children by the reunion with her husband Yahweh. A second typology possibly emerges from the reference of Isa 43:22-28<sup>315</sup> where Jacob-Israel fails to offer the sacrifice to Yahweh, and this leads to the destruction of Israel; this is associated with common vocabularies shown in the narrative of Jacob's predicament to Mesopotamia (Gen 30-32).<sup>316</sup> A third typology comes from the reference to Noah's flood, where Yahweh promises Israel's security from her enemies (Gen 6-9; Isa 54:9; Ps 89).<sup>317</sup>

This typological association in Deutero-Isaiah has often been understood as having the influence of a common literary heritage. Paul Shalom, for instance, does not mention the direct reference or allusion of Deutero-Isaiah to the Pentateuch, but rather indicates the broad influence of 'Israel's epic tradition' such as myth, flood, the patriarchal traditions, and the

---

<sup>309</sup> Graham S. Ogden, "Moses and Cyrus," *VT* 28, no. 2 (1978): 195–203.

<sup>310</sup> David M. Gunn, "Deutero-Isaiah and the Flood," *JBL* 94, no. 4 (1975): 493–508.

<sup>311</sup> Gwilym H. Jones, "Abraham and Cyrus: Type and Anti-Type?," *VT* 22, no. 3 (1972): 304–19.

<sup>312</sup> Claude Lionel Chavasse, "Suffering Servant and Moses," *CQR* 165, no. 355 (1964): 152–63.

<sup>313</sup> Klaus Baltzer, "Schriftauslegung Bei Deuterjesaja? - Jes 43,22-28 Als Beispiel," in *Väter Israels* (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1989), 11–16.

<sup>314</sup> Cf. Gen 22:15-17; Isa 51:2. See Willey, *Remember*, 246–7; Sommer, *Prophet*, 133–4.

<sup>315</sup> Baltzer, "Schriftauslegung Bei Deuterjesaja?"

<sup>316</sup> Another typology given here is the allusion where "the nation Israel received the benefits promised by priestly law to a person sold into debt-slavery" (Lev 25:10; Isa 61:1). Sommer, *Prophet*, 140–2.

<sup>317</sup> Willey, *Remember*, 247–9.

Egyptian exodus.<sup>318</sup> In particular, the claim to the use of the Exodus motif in Deutero-Isaiah has often been challenged. Dale Patrick, for example, traces the origin of the imagery of a new exodus bearing the descriptions of the transformation of nature (Isa 43:16-21), and insists that the imagery recalls ‘the epiphanic traditions of Hebrew Scripture and of the ancient Near East’.<sup>319</sup> This opens the possibility of the literary influence of common ancient Near Eastern sources.

The second way in which Deutero-Isaiah resembles Pentateuchal materials appears in the use of the creation theme and related terms in Gen 1:1-2:4a (or ‘Priestly Code’); e.g., Isa 45:7 and Gen 1:2.<sup>320</sup> Sommer, following Moshe Weinfeld, maintains that Deutero-Isaiah develops the priestly creation narrative into a polemic speech against an anthropomorphic view of God drawing from the priestly writer and that Deutero-Isaiah there rejects four representative accounts of the priestly creation in Gen 1:1-2:4a.<sup>321</sup> Firstly, while Genesis suggests that before the creation in Gen 1:1-3, unformed matter described as ‘formlessness’ (תהו), ‘void’ (ובהו), ‘darkness’ (וחשך), and ‘the surface of the deep’ (על־פני תהים) covered the universe, Deutero-Isaiah declares that Yahweh creates everything, including the force of darkness (Isa 45:6-7, 18). Secondly, Deutero-Isaiah rejects the anthropological notion of God in Gen 1:26 (‘Let us make man in our image’), asserting that Yahweh is incomparable to any earthly image (Isa 40:18, 25; 46:25). Thirdly, God in Deutero-Isaiah does not consult any divine beings about his plans (Isa 40:13-14; 44:24), while the heavenly council (‘Let us make’) in Gen 1:26 appears in discussing the creation of humans. Fourthly, Deutero-Isaiah emphasises that God by no means rests, while the priestly writer portrays God resting after the completion of creation (Gen 2:2; Exod 31:17; Isa 40:28).

---

<sup>318</sup> Paul, *Isaiah 40-66*, 44–6.

<sup>319</sup> Patrick, “Epiphanic Imagery,” 126.

<sup>320</sup> Arvid S. Kapelrud, “The Date of the Priestly Code (P),” *ASTI* III (1964): 58–64; Moshe Weinfeld, “God the Creator in Gen. 1 and in the Prophecy of Second Isaiah,” *Tarbiz* 33 (1968): 105–32; Fishbane, *Biblical*, 324–6.

<sup>321</sup> Sommer, *Prophet*, 142–5.

As a result of these differences, Weinfeld and Sommer maintain that Deutero-Isaiah was aware of priestly and JE texts and used them by denying and transforming the ideology of received priestly literatures.<sup>322</sup> Importantly, the Deutero-Isaiah's view on the priestly writer is likely to be in line with Job's critical tone in the relation to the priestly Torah.

The third place is the literary relationships between Deutero-Isaiah and the deuteronomistic texts. Sommer argues that Deutero-Isaiah echoes materials from a Mosaic poem (Deut 33:26-29; Isa 45:14-19),<sup>323</sup> and uses shared terms—e.g., שלח ('send away, divorce')—from prevalent legal practice (Deut 24:1-3; Isa 50:1; Jer 3:1-8; Hos 1-3).<sup>324</sup> Paul presents various affinities between the deuteronomistic texts and Deutero-Isaiah that are mostly linked with specific terms and phrases alongside common themes; 'the nature and uniqueness of the God of Israel,' 'the nature of God's relationship with Israel,' and 'the nature of the temple'.<sup>325</sup> Verbal parallels that he notices are given as evidence of the direct influence of the deuteronomistic texts on Deutero-Isaiah; e.g., Deut 4:35, 39; 32:12; 32:39; 1 Sam 2:2; 2 Sam 7:22; 22:32; 1 Kgs 8:23; 8:60; Jer 10:6//Isa 43:10, 11; 44:6; 45:5, 6, 14, 18, 21, 22; 46:9. There is a thought-provoking presentation from parallels presented by Paul, but they lack analogies to designate a literary relationship between Deutero-Isaiah and Deuteronomy.<sup>326</sup>

There is little reason to reject the literary influence of the Deuteronomistic theology on Deutero-Isaiah, but like the book of Job, it is significant to notice how Deuter-Isaiah evaluates Mosaic laws and covenants; the intra-biblical analysis between Deuteronomy and Deutero-

---

<sup>322</sup> Ibid., 149–51.

<sup>323</sup> Ibid., 136–7.

<sup>324</sup> Ibid., 138; Sommer comments from these similarities: "Deutero-Isaiah and Hosea agree that God and Israel will be reconciled, while Jeremiah views reconciliation as impossible".

<sup>325</sup> Shalom M. Paul, "Deuteronom(ist)ic Influences on Deutero-Isaiah," in *Mishneh Todah* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009), 219–27.

<sup>326</sup> For another instance, Janzen argues that Deutero-Isaiah in Isa 51:2 uses the word נִחַם, in order to echo the Shema (Deut 6:4-5), but there is no solid ground for this association. See J. Gerald Janzen, "An Echo of the Shema in Isaiah 51:1-3," *JSOT*, no. 43 (1989): 69–82.



Isaiah seems to have a bias by assuming that Deutero-Isaiah is embracing ‘the kerygma’ of Deuteronomy, without paying the attention to differences in tone and theology.<sup>327</sup>

### 3.2 *The Book of Jeremiah*

#### 3.2.1 Job and Jeremiah

It has been appreciated that Job has even more common features with Jeremiah than with any other prophetic books. Most scholars seem to agree that the language and motifs of the book of Job are inseparably bound up with Jeremiah,<sup>328</sup> at the very least, Jeremiah’s character as a righteous prophet undergoing suffering substantially resembles Job. According to Greenstein, the author of Job is ‘attenuating the Jeremiah source’; he suggests five areas corresponding to parallels between Jeremiah and Job where Jeremiah ‘appears to have served as a model’ of inspiration for Job.<sup>329</sup> Katharine Dell, like Greenstein, argues: ‘that Job is imitating and progressing the sentiments of Jeremiah is the most natural literary and historical conclusion, even if they do both owe something to a wider lament tradition’,<sup>330</sup> she further proposes passages of Jeremiah’s confessions which are supposed to function as inspiration or source to the book of Job. From the observations of Greenstein and Dell, I present five associations between Jeremiah and Job. Firstly, Jeremiah and Job as righteous sufferers experience isolation, abandonment, and betrayal from people and God, and lament over their losses in their

---

<sup>327</sup> Walter Brueggemann, “Isaiah 55 and Deuteronomistic Theology,” *ZAW* 80, no. 2 (1968): 191–203; Sommer, *Prophet*, 140, 155.

<sup>328</sup> Dhorme, *Job*, clix–clxii; Terrien, “Job: Introduction,” 889; Edward L. Greenstein, “Jeremiah as an Inspiration to the Poet of Job,” in *Inspired Speech: Prophecy in the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of Herbert B. Huffmon*, ed. John Kaltner and Louis Stulman, JSOT (London; NY: T&T Clark, 2004), 98–110; Katharine J. Dell, “‘Cursed Be the Day I Was Born!’: Job and Jeremiah Revisited,” in *Reading Job Intertextually* (NY: T&T Clark, 2013), 106–17.

<sup>329</sup> Greenstein, “Jeremiah,” 99.

<sup>330</sup> Dell is alert to the dangers of form-critical classifications of the lament genre, and classifies parallel examples “as a re-use of known tradition rather than as a misuse with parodic intent”. See Dell, “Job,” 107, 116.

‘confessions’ (e.g. Jer 18:18-20). Greenstein suggests two images related to this theme: the imagery of נחל (‘the dry wadi’) in Job 6:15, 28 with the verb אכזב (‘to lie, deceive’) to emphasise personal disappointment (cf. כמו אכזב, ‘like a dried-up-wadi’) in Jer 15:17-18b; and the motif of ‘economic dependency’ (Jer 15:10; Job 6:22-23).<sup>331</sup>

The second similarity is found in the description of the cursing on the day of the individual’s birth.<sup>332</sup> Terrien proposes seven verbal and thematic similarities between Job 3:3-26 and Jer 20:14-18; Dell notices that both characters use cursing language (קלל in Job 3:1b, קבב in Job 3:8a, ארר in Job 3:8a; Jer 20:14) about the day of birth (Jer 20:14-18; Job 3:1-12; 10:18-19).<sup>333</sup> The most frequently cited correspondence in terms of the statement of self-curse is:

יאבד יום אולד בו והלילה אמר הרה גבר  
*Perish the day on which I was born, and the night that said, ‘A new-born male is conceived!’ (Job 3:3)*

ארור היום אשר ילדתי בו יום אשר-ילדתני אמי אל-יהי ברוך  
 ארור האיש אשר בשר את-אבי לאמר ילד-לך בן זכר שמחה שמחהו  
*Cursed be the day on which I was born! The day when my mother bore me, let it not be blessed! Cursed be the man who brought the news to my father, saying, “A son is born to you,” giving him such joy. (Jer 20:14-15)*

Thirdly, both figures complain about the prosperity of the wicked and their children, and use the form of the indictment in the rhetorical question (Job 21:7; Jer 12:1b; cf. Hab 1:13).<sup>334</sup>

מדוע רשעים יחיו עתקו גם-גברו חיל  
*Why do the wicked live, prosper,<sup>335</sup> and grow mighty in power? (Job 21:7)*  
 מדוע דרך רשעים צלחה שלו כל-בגדי בגד  
*Why does the way of the wicked thrive? Why are all who are treacherous at ease? (Jer 12:1b)*

<sup>331</sup> Greenstein, “Jeremiah,” 100–2. See also other connections between Jer 15:10-21 and Job 6:22-23, 15; 34:6, 13:22, 31:35a; Dell, “Job,” 112–4; Dhorme, *Job*, clxii.

<sup>332</sup> This theme could be adopted by the poet of Job from Jeremiah passages (Terrien, Dhorme, Greenstein, Dell) or could be rooted on a common source (Carroll, Tur-Sinai).

<sup>333</sup> Terrien, “Job: Introduction,” 889; Dell, “Job,” 109–10.

<sup>334</sup> Greenstein, “Jeremiah,” 103–4; Dell, “Job,” 115.

<sup>335</sup> The verb עתקו here has the meaning of “thrive” in a complementary sense to the phrase גברו חיל in v. 7b rather than “to grow old” (also TNK). See Gray, *Job*, 293.

A fourth similarity is that both books take up the typical form of prophetic litigation (Jer 12:1-6; Job 9; 13:15; 23:2-17). Greenstein and Dell assume a literary dependence, claiming that this common form in Job originates in and is expanded from Jeremiah (Jer 12:1-6; Job 9; 13:15; 23:2-17);<sup>336</sup> Greenstein holds that the author of Job for specific cases is inspired by Jeremiah; the form of Jeremiah's lawsuit and the prophetic רִיב pattern (Jer 2:4-13).

Fifthly, parallels between Jer 20:7-12 and Job's texts, according to Dell, reflect 'lament psalms and other prophetic outpourings', as Jeremiah's passages are significantly echoing Job's lament and agony in dialogue.<sup>337</sup> She notices that these expressions 'have the context of God being to blame'; in שְׂחֹק (‘laughingstock’; Jer 20:7b; Job 12:4a, 30:1a); in לַעַג (‘mock’; Jer 20:7b) and נִגְנָן (‘mocking song’; Job 30:9); in אֶזְעָק (‘cry out’; Jer 20:8; cf. Job 35:9) and אֶצְעָק (‘cry out’; Job 19:7); in חֲמָם (‘violence’; Jer 20:8; Job 19:7).<sup>338</sup>

The explanations of these resemblances have been given as the direct influence of Jeremiah on Job (Dhorme),<sup>339</sup> or recently as the ‘parody’ of texts of Jeremiah—‘subversion of convention’ (Greenstein),<sup>340</sup> or in ‘a reuse of known tradition’ (Dell).<sup>341</sup> However, their claims are limited, to the extent that they presume that the text of Jeremiah is earlier and more original than the text of Job; though partly it is quite true.

---

<sup>336</sup> Dell maintains from the examples of Job 9:2-3 and Jer 12:1a that “legal language in the attempt with God seems to originate here in Jeremiah.” See Dell, “Job,” 114–5. Also, refer to Greenstein, “Jeremiah,” 104–5.

<sup>337</sup> Dell, “Job,” 111.

<sup>338</sup> See *ibid.*, 110–1.

<sup>339</sup> Dhorme, *Job*, clxii.

<sup>340</sup> Greenstein, “Jeremiah,” 107.

<sup>341</sup> Dell, “Job,” 116.

### 3.2.2 Deutero-Isaiah and Jeremiah

Resemblances between Jeremiah and Deutero-Isaiah have more remarkable parallels than any other biblical books.<sup>342</sup> Most scholars such as Cassuto, Paul, Willey, and Sommer have maintained that Deutero-Isaiah either quotes, alludes to, or echoes Jeremiah's language by directly adopting Jeremiah's wordings or by reformulating them in a new context and style. Sommer and Paul, by contrast, accept the possibility that Deutero-Isaiah could have become similar to Jeremiah by being influenced by common literary traditions such as 'Mesopotamian royal and prophetic ideologies' and Israelite literature; although both prefer the direct borrowing of Deutero-Isaiah.<sup>343</sup> The following are examples of the affinities between Job and Jeremiah.

The first category of resemblances is to be derived from the motif concerning the return from exile.<sup>344</sup> Willey suggests six verbal and thematic affinities to be seen in Jer 31:8-10 and Isa 49:9-13. For instance, the imagery of gathered sheep under the shepherd's care in Jeremiah (Isa 40:11; 49:9-10; Jer 31:8-9; cf. Mic 2:12; Ezek 34:11) is connected to the return of the exiled community in Deutero-Isaiah:<sup>345</sup>

כרעה עדרו ירעה בזרעו יקבץ טלאים ובחיקו ישא עלות ינהל

---

<sup>342</sup> Cassuto, "Formal"; Shalom M. Paul, "Literary and Ideological Echoes of Jeremiah in Deutero-Isaiah," in *Proceedings of the 5th World Congress of Jewish Studies, v 1, Hebrew Univ, Jerusalem, 1969* (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1973), 102–20; William L. Holladay, *Jeremiah 2: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Chapters 26-52*, ed. Paul D. Hanson, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 86–8; Willey, *Remember*, 137–42, 151–5, 193–206, 241–6; Sommer, *Prophet*, 32–72.

<sup>343</sup> Paul, "Jeremiah," 119–20; Sommer, *Prophet*, 33; Laato claims that the servant and Cyrus passages in Deutero-Isaiah are connected with "the courtly language reflected in the Akkadian royal inscriptions." Antti Laato, *The Servant of YHWH and Cyrus: A Reinterpretation of the Exilic Messianic Programme in Isaiah 40-55*, CB 35 (Stockholm: Almqvist&Wiksell, 1992), 47–68.

<sup>344</sup> Paul, "Jeremiah," 105–6; Willey, *Remember*, 204–6; Cassuto, "Formal," 150–1.

<sup>345</sup> Willey, *Remember*, 204.

*Like a shepherd, he tends his flock, gathers the lambs in his arms and he carries them in his bosom, and gently lead the suckling mother sheep.*<sup>346</sup> (Isa 40:11)

וְשָׁמְעוּ דְבַר־יְהוָה גּוֹיִם וְהִגִּידוּ בְּאֵיִם מִמְּרָחֵק וְאָמְרוּ מִזְרַח יִשְׂרָאֵל יִקְבְּצֵנוּ וְשָׁמְרוּ כְרֵעָה עֲדָרוֹ

*Hear the word of Yahweh, O nations, and Tell it in the coastlands far away; Say, he who scattered Israel will gather him, and will guard him as a shepherd keeps his flock (Jer 31:10)*

The second is found both in the figure of Jeremiah as a suffering prophet and in Yahweh's servant in Deutero-Isaiah. These corresponding verses speak of the divine appointment and the calling to Jeremiah and Yahweh's servant (Isa 49:5-6; Jer 1:5; cf. Isa 42:6);<sup>347</sup> e.g., see the following parallel which contains a unique parallel in the OT:

וְעַתָּה אָמַר יְהוָה יִצְרִי מִבֶּטֶן לְעַבְדִּי לֹ

וְנִתְּתִיךָ לְאוֹר גּוֹיִם לְהִיּוֹת יְשׁוּעָתִי עַד־קֶצֶה הָאָרֶץ...

*And now Yahweh has said, he who formed me from the womb as his servant, ... I will make you as a light for the nations to be my salvation to the end of the earth (Isa 49:5a, 6b)*

בְּטֶרֶם אֶצְוֶרְךָ בִּבְטֶן יָדַעְתִּיךָ וּבְטֶרֶם תֵּצֵא מִרֶחֶם הַקֹּדֶשֶׁתִיךָ נָבִיא לְגוֹיִם נִתְּתִיךָ

*"Before I formed<sup>348</sup> you in the womb I knew you, and before you came forth from the womb I consecrated you; I appointed you as a prophet to the nations." (Jer 1:5)*

Sommer, moreover, suggests the life and suffering of Jeremiah as original types of Jacob-Israel and the Servant in Deutero-Isaiah: 'Jeremiah and the nation' (Isa 51:16//Jer 1:9-10; Isa 51:12-14//Jer 11:19-21); 'Jeremiah and servant figures' (Jer 20:11//Isa 50:6-7; Jer 20:9//Isa 53:7-8; Jer 11:19//Isa 53:7-8).<sup>349</sup> Dell, similarly, argues that the Servant of Yahweh in Deutero-Isaiah echoes the language of Jeremiah (Isa 49:1b//Jer 1:5a; Isa 53:7b//Jer 11:19a; Isa 53:8b//Jer 11:19c), and mentions possible links to Jeremiah's life and thought.<sup>350</sup> She examines Farley's

<sup>346</sup> The phrase עֲלֹת יִנְהֵל describes the shepherd's concern in caring for suckling ewes; עֲלֹת Qal, pt, "suckling". Jan Leunis Koole, *Isaiah Part III Vol 1: Isaiah 40-48*, HCOT (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1997), 79.

<sup>347</sup> Cassuto, "Formal," 156; Willey, *Remember*, 193-7. There is a difference at this point; i.e., Deutero-Isaiah expands the divine mission to Israel (42:1-4; 50:4). See Paul, "Jeremiah," 109.

<sup>348</sup> K, אֶצְוֶרְךָ; Q, אֶצְרֶךָ (qal, impf).

<sup>349</sup> Sommer, *Prophet*, 61-6.

<sup>350</sup> Katharine J. Dell, "The Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah: Jeremiah Revisited," in *Genesis, Isaiah, and Psalms* (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 119-34.

study of Jeremiah's references in Deutero-Isaiah's servant songs (Isa 42:1-4; 49:1-6; 50:4-9; 52:13-53:12), and concludes that, though not all parallels are convincing, some connections are valid and evince that Jeremiah's identity as Yahweh's servant influenced the similar picture in Deutero-Isaiah.<sup>351</sup>

The third is the metaphor of 'bridal ornament' and 'unforgettable woman' (Jer 2:32; Isa 49:15) where the use of the verb—*התשכח* ('can she forget?')—is unique in the Hebrew Bible; 'Can a woman forget her nursing child?' in Deutero-Isaiah; 'can a virgin forget her ornaments?' in Jeremiah.<sup>352</sup> While Yahweh is compared with an authentic mother of a child in Deutero-Isaiah (49:15), Israel in Jeremiah is portrayed as a disloyal bride. The imagery of 'ornament' (*כעדי*) and 'binding them like a bride' (*ותקשרים ככלה*) in Isa 49:18 advances one more step from Jeremiah's passage in which Yahweh declares that Zion will never lose her gathered children.

The fourth similarity occurs in the covenantal relationship with God in making 'a new thing' (*חדשה*) (Isa 43:19; Jer 31:22) and a new 'covenant' (Jer 31:31; cf. Isa 55:3). It has been argued that the prophecy of the new covenant in Jeremiah (Jer 31:31-36) is restated and repeated in Deutero-Isaiah (Isa 42:5-9; 43:25; 54:10, 13; 55:3).<sup>353</sup> The most striking parallel between the two books is a seven word-pair verbatim in Isa 51:15 and Jer 31:35 in which corresponding texts describe the power of Yahweh bounding the chaotic sea: *רגע הים ויהמו גליו יהוה צבאות* ('who stirs up the sea when its waves roar; Yahweh of hosts is his name').<sup>354</sup> Other noteworthy cases occur in longer passages, although they have fewer verbal correspondences; for example, in the metaphor of Jerusalem's devastated tent (Jer 4:20b; 10:20; Isa 54:1-2)<sup>355</sup>

---

<sup>351</sup> F. A. Farley, "Jeremiah and 'The Suffering Servant of Jehovah' in Deutero-Isaiah," *ET* 38, no. 11 (1927): 521–24.

<sup>352</sup> Paul, "Jeremiah," 114; Cassuto, "Formal," 157; Holladay, *Jeremiah* 2, 87; Willey, *Remember*, 197–200; Sommer, *Prophet*, 37.

<sup>353</sup> Paul, "Jeremiah," 116–7; Holladay, *Jeremiah* 2, 88; Willey, *Remember*, 137–41; Sommer, *Prophet*, 46–50.

<sup>354</sup> Cassuto, "Formal," 151; Willey, *Remember*, 138, 140.

<sup>355</sup> Willey, *Remember*, 241–3; Sommer, *Prophet*, 38–40.

and the fulfillment of the earlier prophecy about double-payment of punishment and payment (Isa 40:2; Jer 16:18).<sup>356</sup>

Overall, foregoing studies between Deutero-Isaiah and Jeremiah would confirm literary associations, concluding that Deutero-Isaiah intentionally uses the specific texts in Jeremiah.<sup>357</sup> Though not all the cases affirm the priority of Jeremiah over Deutero-Isaiah, those resemblances are likely to have dominant cases among the literary relationships of Deutero-Isaiah.

### 3.3 *First and Third Isaiah*

#### 3.3.1 Job and First/Third Isaiah

We may see a few common connections between Job and First/Third Isaiah (Isa 1-39, 56-66). For instance, both Job 12:13 and Isa 11:2 include common words such as חכמה ('wisdom'), גבורה ('might'), עצה ('counsel'), and תבונה (בִּינָה in Deutero-Isaiah; 'understanding') (cf. Prov.

---

<sup>356</sup> Two passages (Isa 40:2; 61:7) share four common terms with Jer 16:18, חטאת ("sin"), עון ("punishment", "guilt"), ארץ ("land"), משנה ("double"). Paul, "Jeremiah," 103-4; Sommer, *Prophet*, 57-8.

<sup>357</sup> There are other verbal and theological similarities between the two books which are not mentioned here. Paul divides them into three categories according to the level of literary dependence on Jeremiah; (1) the direct use of Jeremiah's passages: "reward" and "recompense" (Isa 40:9; Jer 31:15-16), the return of the exile through "an express highway" (Isa 40:3; 42:16; Jer 31:8, 20; cf. Isa 35:5-8), "the redeemed of the Lord" (Isa 45:11; Jer 31:10-11; cf. Isa 35:10); (2) the creative readaptation with the reference of cuneiform royal inscriptions: the divine encouragement (Jer 1:8-9; Isa 41:10; 51:16), the polemic against idols (Jer 50:41; 27:5-6; Isa 41:25; 45:12-13), the Creator God (Jer 33:2; Isa 45:18), protection of Israel (Jer 51:19; Isa 51:13-14), and series of disasters (Jer 15:2; Isa 51:19); (3) coincidental examples. See Paul, "Jeremiah". Cf. other similarities: "the certificate of Divorce" (Jer 3:1; Isa 50:1; cf. Deut 24:1-4); "Zion's shame" (Jer 2:1-2; 3:24-25; 31:19; Isa 54:4). See Willey, *Remember*, 200-4, 243-6. C.f., (1) reversing Jeremiah's earlier messages in Deutero-Isaiah's context (Jer 14:2-9, Isa 42:10-16) and transforming motifs of "blind people" and "drought imagery"; (2) repredicting by which Deutero-Isaiah reformulates prophecies of Jeremiah concerning messages of Israelites' restoration: "pray and response"; Jer 29:10-14; Isa 55:6-12; (3) fulfilling the old prophecy of Jeremiah: Jer 9:6; Isa 48:10-11; typological link: Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus (Jer 27:5-6; Isa 45:12-13), God's word in people's mouth (Jer 1:9-10; Isa 51:16). See Sommer, *Prophet*, 32-72.

8:14),<sup>358</sup> and there is the similar phrase ‘conceiving disaster and bringing forth harm’, הרה עמל (Job 15:35) and וילד און (Isa 59:4).<sup>359</sup> Studies of the interconnections between Job and First/Third Isaiah, however, have been mostly overlooked in biblical scholarship, or at least no authoritative researches have been conducted; although there have been studies concerning a wide range of wisdom influence on the texts of Isaiah. All three commentators—Hartley, Dhorme, and Cheyne—deal with a heavy list of verbal parallels and common themes between Job and Deutero-Isaiah, but hardly pay attention to First/Third Isaiah. Hartley mentions only three parallels (Job 12:24-5//Isa 19:14; Job 14:11//Isa 19:5; Job 15:35a//Isa 59:4d (cf. Ps 7:15 [Eng 14])), Dhorme omits First Isaiah and presents two parallels with Third Isaiah (Job 30:21//Isa 63:10; Job 5:7; 15:35//Isa 59:4), and Cheyne presents only two parallels with First Isaiah (Job 14:11//Isa 19:5; Job 11:6//Isa 28:29).<sup>360</sup> If given the larger scale of First/Third Isaiah, the paucity of commonalities between Job and First/Third Isaiah is surprising.

### 3.3.2 Deutero-Isaiah and First/Third Isaiah

No doubt, Deutero-Isaiah has close linguistic connections with First and Third Isaiah; though the extent of interconnections is various according scholars. It has taken it for granted that in

---

<sup>358</sup> See following links between First Isaiah and Job. The unique phrase ‘the river will be parched and dry’ (ונהר יחרב ויבש) (with מים and ים) only occurs in Job 14:11 and Isa 19:5 within the Old Testament. The imagery of ‘dry water’ in Job 14:11 is intended to emphasize the impossibility of returning from the dead, while in Isa 19:5 (cf. 37:25; 51:10) this imagery illustrates the destruction of the Egyptians. Two word pairs, ‘making them stagger’ (תעה) and ‘like a drunken man’ (שכור) found in both Isa 19:14 (Isa 24:20a; cf. 28:7) and Job 12:24-25 are able to illustrate God’s anger over humanity (cf. Ps 107: 27, 40). The disclosure (כסה) of blood (דם) from the earth is used both by Job 16:18 and Isa 26:21 (cf. Gen 4:10; 37:26; Lev 17:13; Ps 9:13). The poetic imagery, putting (שים) the hook (חוק) in the nose of the enemy (אף), is commonly used. The hook (חוק) in Job 40:26 (Eng. 41:2) is used of ‘a thorn put into the branchiae of a fish to carry it home’ (NIDOTE, vol. 2., 44) and חה (‘hook’) in Isa 37:29b (2 Kgs 19:28) appears in a military context.

<sup>359</sup> Dhorme consider this case as the “part of the common stock of tradition” and Dhorme as “a dependence of Isaiah on Job”. See Dhorme, *Job*, clvii; Nurmela, *Mouth*, 104.

<sup>360</sup> Hartley, *Job*, 12; Dhorme, *Job*, clvi–clvii; Cheyne, *Job*, 87.



the redactional history of the book of Isaiah, Deutero-Isaiah partly or wholly expounds First Isaiah adding a fuller meaning.<sup>361</sup> This interpretive inclination has been continued in recent scholarship which says that specific passages (e.g. Isa 40:1-11//6:1-3; 28:1-5) in Deutero-Isaiah have been developed with direct reference to the First Isaiah.<sup>362</sup> As an example, Hugh Williamson maintains that Deutero-Isaiah was involved in the compositional process of one written book for the purpose of presenting God's continuing work.<sup>363</sup> Based on this claim, he argues that there are many passages in Isa 1-39 which might have been redacted by Deutero-Isaiah or by other later redactors after Deutero-Isaiah.<sup>364</sup> In a slightly different way, interpreters such as Rolf Rendtorff, Graham Davies, and Sommer have questioned whether parts of the First Isaiah have been used for composing Deutero-Isaiah as a source text,<sup>365</sup> and they have highlighted the broad prophetic tradition concerning the formation of Deutero-Isaiah. For instance, Sommer maintains that Deutero-Isaiah—Sommer extends the extent of Deutero-Isaiah

---

<sup>361</sup> See the following references; Ronald E. Clements, "Beyond Tradition-History: Deutero-Isaianic Development of First Isaiah's Themes," *JSOT*, no. 31 (1985): 95–113; Christopher R. Seitz, "The Divine Council: Temporal Transition and New Prophecy in the Book of Isaiah," *JBL* 109, no. 2 (1990): 229–47; Williamson, *Called*.

<sup>362</sup> For instance, the passage Isa 40:1-31 has a striking relationship with Isa 6 and 28; that, more specifically, Isa 40:1-11 overlaps with the theme of divine council in Isa 6:5, 9, 10 and Isa 40:12-31, turning the prophetic message of judgment (Isa 6) and warning (Isa 28) to one of the hope of restoration (cf. Isa 35). See Goldingay, *Isaiah vol. I*, 58–9.

<sup>363</sup> Williamson, *Called*.

<sup>364</sup> E.g., Isa 1:11, 18; 33:10(//40:1, 25; 41:21); 1:24(//49:26; cf. 60:16); 1:25(//48:10); 5:24(//47:14); 5:26; 11:12(//49:22); 6(//40:1-8); 8:10(//40:8, 44:26, 46:10); 8:17(//40:27, 31; 49:23; 54:8); 8:23b(//41:4; 44:6; 48:12); 10:5-19(//45:8-13); 11:1-5(//40:24; 42:1-4); 17:13; 29:5(//41:15-16); 18:6(//46:11); 28:1-4(//40:6-8); 28:17(//42:4); 29:16(//45:9); 30:7(//51:9); 30:8(//43:8-13); 31:2(//44:25-6; 45:7, 23; 55:11); 30:9(//42:4, 21, 24; 51:4, 7); 30:12(//50:10). See *ibid.*, 240–1. To explain a probable interrelationship between Isa 1-39 and Isa 40-55, Williamson further suggests that various passages cumulatively in Isa 1-39 have intertextual links that would probably be edited either by Deutero-Isaiah or by another redactor; (1) Isa 2:2-5; 5:25-30; 8:21-23; 11:11-16; 12 (2) 13:1; 14:1-4a; 24-27; (3) 28:1-4; 33; 34-35; 36-9. *Ibid.*, 117–240.

<sup>365</sup> Benjamin D. Sommer, "Allusions and Illusions: The Unity of the Book of Isaiah in Light of Deutero-Isaiah's Use of Prophetic Tradition," in *New Visions of Isaiah* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 156–86; Graham I. Davies, "The Destiny of the Nations in the Book of Isaiah," in *Book of Isaiah- Le Livre d'Isaie* (Louvain: Leuven UP, 1989), 93–120; Rolf Rendtorff, "Isaiah 6 in the Framework of the Composition of the Book," in *Canon and Theology: Overtures to an Old Testament Theology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 170–80.

into Chapters 40–66—was influenced by First Isaiah, but on the other hand holds that First Isaiah was not a unique source for Deutero-Isaiah; see examples in Isa 28:1–5//Isa 40:1–10//Jer 16:16–18; 31:16//Ezek 21:2–12.<sup>366</sup> He argues that ‘Isaiah 40–66 were not written to be a part of the book of Isaiah nor to be included in the Isaiah tradition but were added to it secondarily’.<sup>367</sup> It is surprising from his observations that some affinities between passages in Jeremiah and Deutero-Isaiah’s passages which contain allusions to Jeremiah—e.g., Isa 40:9//Jer 31:16; Isa 42:1–9//Isa 11; Isa 60:5–7//Isa 2:1–4; Isa 60:7–13//Jer 3:16–18—are stronger than specific texts of Deutero-Isaiah which have allusions to First Isaiah; he says:

*The resemblances between Deutero-Isaiah’s allusions to Isaiah and his borrowings from Jeremiah indicates that neither of these pre-exilic prophets played a unique role in Deutero-Isaiah’s work. Both are important influences. ... he participates in a wider prophetic tradition, ... Deutero-Isaiah depends on Isaiah and Jeremiah in similar ways—but not to the same extent. His affinity to Jeremiah is stronger.*<sup>368</sup>

This is not the place for discussing all the theories of the redaction history of Isa 1–55, nor for explaining the multiple authorships of the book. In a nutshell, what I agree with is that two sets of linguistic resemblances between Deutero-Isaiah/Jeremiah and Isa 1–39 seem to corroborate Sommer’s view that the author of Deutero-Isaiah is using broad prophetic texts. Furthermore, it might be a possible approach that from verbal and thematic affinities between Isa 34–35 and Isa 40–55,<sup>369</sup> an author or a group of editors in a later stage possibly produced the literary unit of Isa 1–55 in a consistent style.

---

<sup>366</sup> Sommer, *Prophet*, 165.

<sup>367</sup> Sommer, “Allusions and Illusions,” 173.

<sup>368</sup> *Ibid.*, 176.

<sup>369</sup> Some (Mavin Pope and Shalom Paul) suggest the possibility that Isa 34–35 originally was added to First Isaiah by Deutero-Isaiah; Marvin H. Pope, “Isaiah 34 in Relation to Isaiah 35, 40–66,” *JBL* 71, no. 4 (1952): 235–43; Paul, *Isaiah 40–66*, 50–2. Sommer omits Isa 34 in this list, saying that there is “no clear case of allusion” between Isa 34 and Isa 40–66; Sommer, *Prophet*, 192; also refer to Benjamin D. Sommer, “New Light on the Composition of Jeremiah,” *CBQ* 61, no. 4 (1999): 646–66.

Correlations between Deutero-Isaiah and Third Isaiah have by and large been accepted and probably many parts in Isa 56-66 might be the result of reinterpreting and developing the content and historical events in Isa 40-55 and 1-39. B. S. Childs maintains that there are significant passages within Third Isaiah which affirm that the redactor of Isaiah 56-66 intentionally referred to First Isaiah and Deutero-Isaiah.<sup>370</sup> On the other hand, Joseph Blenkinsopp—criticising the canonical approach in which Childs and Christopher Seitz argue that ‘chs. 40-66 were deliberately dehistoricized to enable them to be read as the eschatological fulfillment of the prophecies in chs. 1-39’—sees each part of Isa 40-55 and 56-66 as distinct sections.<sup>371</sup> Nonetheless, he also considers the deliberate continuity between Deutero-Isaiah and Third Isaiah, and provides seven Isaianic connections which are similar in word and metaphor; ‘comfort’ (40:1; 49:13; 51:3, 12, 19; 52:9//61:2-3; 66:13), ‘the way’ (40:3; 43:19; 49:11//57:14; 62:10), ‘the coming of God (with power)’ (40:10; 48:14; 51:5//59:16=63:5; 62:8), ‘the glory of God’ (40:5//58:8, 10; 59:9; 60:1-2, 19-20), ‘the Creator God’ (40:26, 28; 42:5; 45:7-8, 12, 18//65:17-18), ‘justice, righteousness, salvation’ (40:14, 27; 42:1, 3, 4; 49:4; 51:4; 53:8; 54:14//56:1; 58:2; 59:8, 14; 61:8), ‘the Servant and the Servants’ (41:8-9; 44:1-2, 22; 45:4; 48:20; 49:3, 5, 6-7; 50:10; 52:13; 53:11; 54:17//56:6; 63:17; 65:8-9, 13-15; 66:14).<sup>372</sup> Nurmela examines the literary allusion between Deutero-Isaiah and Third Isaiah and presents four specific allusions in Deutero-Isaiah and fourteen in Third Isaiah.<sup>373</sup> For instance, the

---

<sup>370</sup> Childs, *Isaiah*, 446.

<sup>371</sup> Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 56-66: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 19B (NY: Doubleday, 2003), 29–30.

<sup>372</sup> *Ibid.*, 31–3.

<sup>373</sup> For the full list of connections of Trito-Isaiah with reference to Deutero-Isaiah, see Jean Charles Bastiaens, *Trito-Isaiah: An Exhaustive Concordance of Isa. 56-66, Especially with Reference to Deutero-Isaiah: An Example of Computer Assisted Research* (Amsterdam: VU Uitgeverij, 1984); Seizo Sekine, *Die Tritojesajanische Sammlung - Jes 56-66 - Redaktionsgeschichtlich Untersucht*, BZAW 175 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1989).

noteworthy phrase between Isa 40:10 and Isa 62:11b is noticed (also, פנו דרך ('prepare the way') Isa 40:3//62:10; 57:14).<sup>374</sup>

הנה ישעך בא הנה שכרו אתו ופעלתו לפניו  
*Behold, your salvation comes; behold, his reward is with him, and his recompense is before him (62:11b)*  
 הנה אדני יהוה בחזק יבוא וזרעו משלה לו הנה שכרו אתו ופעלתו לפניו  
*Behold, the Lord Yahweh comes with strength, and his arm rules for him; behold, his reward is with him, and his recompense is before him. (Isa 40:10)*

### 3.4 The Book of Psalms

#### 3.4.1 Job and Psalms

Interpreters have seen the close relationship between Psalms and Job through verbal and thematic links;<sup>375</sup> Dhorme discusses passages in Psalms (Ps 1, 37, 73, 103, 107, and 144) as cases from which the author of Job directly borrows,<sup>376</sup> and Hartley presents thirteen parallels with Psalms.<sup>377</sup> The most comprehensive study of the association between the book of Job and hymnic forms, including the book of Psalms, has been produced by Dell; detailed examination of the link shows that ‘parody’—namely, the ‘misuse’ of well-known forms—represents the overall genre of the book of Job, and that Job’s author adopts and transforms conventional forms of hymn in the sceptical context of Job.<sup>378</sup> Her findings to some extent might confirm the association between Job and Psalms as the parody of literary forms such as ‘hymn’, ‘praise to God’, ‘lament’, and ‘prayer’.<sup>379</sup> Following Dell’s approach of hymns in Job, a thorough study

---

<sup>374</sup> Nurmela, *Mouth*, 119–20. Blenkinsopp notes that the expression in 62:11c quotes 40:10b; Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 56-66*, 33.

<sup>375</sup> Moses Bottenwieser, *The Psalms. Chronologically Treated, with a New Translation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938), 524–54 explains links with Ps 73, 139, 39, and 23. Also refer to Schmid, “Innerbiblische.”

<sup>376</sup> Ps 73 recalls Jeremiah as well as Job. See Dhorme, *Job*, clxii–clxv.

<sup>377</sup> Hartley, *Job*, 11–2.

<sup>378</sup> See Dell, *Sceptical*.

<sup>379</sup> The following correspondences are associated passages of Job and Psalms: Job 3:11-26, Ps 88:4-5; Job 6:8-10, Ps 55:6-8; Job 7:7-8, 11-12, 14:1-2, Ps 8; Job 9:5-10, Ps 104; Job 10:2-12, Ps 139; Job 12:7-

of Job's use of Psalms has been done by Kynes who claims that the dialogue part in Job parodies Psalms.<sup>380</sup> Annette Krüger, to take another example, notices that the texts of Ps 104 extensively appear in Job's speeches (Job 7:12; 9:5; 9:7-8; 22-27) indicating unique verbal correspondences and similar motifs.<sup>381</sup>

The most remarkable example appears with words such as רוח, אסף, גוע, עפר, and שוב between Job 34:14-15 and Ps 104:29-30a where Elihu defends God's righteous act against Job; Christian Frevel says that Elihu's text refers to Ps 104:29-30, although there are other related passages in Gen 3:19, Job 10:9, Eccl 3:20.<sup>382</sup>

אִם-יִשִּׁים אֱלֹהֵי לִבּוֹ רוּחוֹ וְנִשְׁמָתוֹ אֵלָיו יֹאסֵף יִגּוּעַ כָּל-בָּשָׂר יַחַד וְאָדָם עַל-עֹפֶר יִשׁוּב  
*If he were to set his mind to it, and gathers to himself his spirit and his breath,  
all flesh together would die, and humanity would return to dust. (Job 34:14-15)*  
תַּסְתִּיר פָּנֶיךָ יִבְהִלּוּן תִּסַּף רוּחָם יִגּוּעוֹן וְאֶל-עֹפֶרֶם יִשׁוּבוֹן תִּשְׁלַח רוּחְךָ יִבְרָאוּן וְתַחֲדָשׁ  
פְּנֵי אָדָמָה  
*You hide your face, they are terrified; you take away their spirit, they die and  
return to their dust. You send forth your spirit, they are created. (Ps 104:29-30a)*

Another noteworthy example of Job's reference to the Psalms occurs between Job 7:1-19 and two theological views of Ps 8, exalting the divine provision and care for humans, and of Ps 39,

---

12, Ps 98; Job 12:13-25, Ps 107; Job 16:7-14, Ps 94:18-19; Job 19:22, 21:7-13, Ps 10:5-6, 73:3-9; Job 23:8-9, Ps 23. Dell also suggests examples of parody from other parts of the Hebrew Bible and especially from Ecclesiastes. See *ibid.*, 125–47.

<sup>380</sup> Kynes, *My Psalm*, 183–5. The manner of Job's parody of Psalms, according to Kynes, can be described in three categories. The first category of parody is "praise"; Job's parody of texts of Ps 8 (Job 7:17-18; 15:14-16; 19:9; 25:5-6) and of texts of Ps 107 (Job 12:13-13:2; 15:22-24; 21:11, 19). The second category of parody is "supplication" where God's omniscience and omnipresence in Ps 139 are parodied in Job 10, 11:7-9, and 23:8-10 and where the Psalmist's plea in Ps 39 is much more intensified in Job's repeated exclamation (Job 6:8-11; 7; 13:28-14:6). The third is the parody of "instruction" of Ps 1 (by Eliphaz; 5:13-14; 22:18; by Job; 10:3; 13:25; 23:10-11) and Ps 73 (by Job in 7:18; 9:29-31; 19:25-27; 21:13-14; 23:11; by Job's friends in 15:27; 18:3, 11, 14; 20:8). Finally, Kynes claims that the parody of psalms by the author of Job creates two different characters: Job as a model of piety and his friends as representing a lack of faith.

<sup>381</sup> Annette Krüger, *Das Lob des Schöpfers : Studien zu Sprache, Motivik und Theologie von Psalm 104* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2010). Frequently cited parallels mostly appear in the hymn of God's creative power in Job 7:12; 9:5-8. See Christian Frevel, "Telling the Secrets of Wisdom: The Use of Psalm 104 in the Book of Job," in *Reading Job Intertextually* (NY: T&T Clark, 2013), 159–60.

<sup>382</sup> Hartley, *Job*, 12; Frevel, "Priests," 161–2.

lamenting the divine repudiation (Ps 8:5-7, Job 7:17-18; Ps 39:12, Job 7:16; Ps 39:14, Job 7:19; Ps 39:9, Job 7:21).<sup>383</sup> Finally, Douglas Green explores the ‘journey imagery’ in Ps 23 in the literary connections with the whole narrative of Job; e.g., the correspondence between Job 1:1-5 and Ps 23:2 which depicts a man under God’s blessing.<sup>384</sup> However, it is far from clear that Job has any structural and verbal pattern called ‘journey imagery’.

Many connections between Job and Psalms are appreciated in the frame of the quotation of Job from Psalms (Dhorme),<sup>385</sup> of the allusion of Job to Psalms (Kynes, Frevel), or of the misuse of common hymnic forms (Dell). Though we need to be more careful of such diachronic readings in the book of Job, the author of Job would be aware of widespread hymnic styles; I agree to some extent with Dell’s view that the author of Job is adopting widespread hymnic forms.

### 3.4.2 Deutero-Isaiah and Psalms

Similarly, the literary relationship between Deutero-Isaiah and Psalms has been acknowledged in common hymnic forms, as well as in the literary reference.<sup>386</sup> For instance, in a classical study of the book of Psalms, Moses Bultmann maintains that the exilic (Ps 68, 85, 126) and post-exilic psalms (Ps 107, 93, 97, 98, 96) bear verbal and stylistic resemblances to Deutero-Isaiah; though those psalms were not written by Deutero-Isaiah.<sup>387</sup> Another example was carried out by Westermann in which he recognises the existence of ‘enthronement psalms’ and claims either the priority of Isa 52:7-8 over Psalms (e.g., Ps 47) or of Psalms over texts of Deutero-Isaiah afterwards.<sup>388</sup> Jerome Creach maintains that the verbal parallels between Book

---

<sup>383</sup> Schmid, “Innerbiblische,” 258–60; Dell, *Sceptical*, 126–7; Fishbane, *Biblical*, 285–6.

<sup>384</sup> Douglas J. Green, “The Good, the Bad and the Better: Psalm 23 and Job,” in *The Whirlwind*, JSOT 336 (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 69–83.

<sup>385</sup> Dhorme, *Job*, clxii–clxv.

<sup>386</sup> Lynne M. Deming, “Hymnic Language in Deutero-Isaiah: The Calls to Praise and Their Function in the Book” (PhD, Emory University, 1978); Westermann, *Isaiah 40-66*, 23–7.

<sup>387</sup> Bultmann, *The Psalms. Chronologically Treated, with a New Translation*, 257–99, 303–43.

<sup>388</sup> Claus Westermann, *The Praise of God in the Psalms* (London: Epworth Press, 1966), 145–6; Westermann, *Isaiah 40-66*, 23–5.

Four (Ps 90-106) of the Psalter and Deutero-Isaiah have unique connections, especially in the literary structure at the beginning and ending of each text.<sup>389</sup> He concludes that ‘the editors of the Psalter had Second Isaiah as a model when ordering Psalms 90-106.’<sup>390</sup> Paul on the other hand sees parallels as the influence of Psalms on Deutero-Isiah; (1) Isa 40:6-8//Ps 103:15-20; (2) Isa 40:26//Ps 147:4-5; (3) Isa 41:18//Ps 107:35; (4) Isa 42:10//Ps 96:1; 98:1, 3; (5) Isa 42:10-11//Ps 96:11-12; 98:7-8; (6) Isa 42:12//Ps 96:7-8; (7) Isa 43:25-26// Ps 51:3-6; (8) Isa 45:2//Ps 107:16; (9) Isa 45:22-25//Ps 22:24-32.<sup>391</sup> In those arguments, the frequently cited parallels between Psalms and Deutero-Isaiah having no resemblances to other prophetic books, are Ps 81 (//Isa 48:12-21), 89 (//Isa 55:1-3; cf. 2 Sam 7), and 98 (//Isa 42:10-12; 52:8-10), while other correspondences usually appear as overlapping with prophetic materials’; e.g., Isa 51:7 includes shared words with Ps 37:31 and Jer 31:32.<sup>392</sup>

Let us see more examples. Firstly, both Ps 89 and Deutero-Isaiah produce parallel expressions to the covenant bestowed upon David; Isa 55:1-5 especially has eight verbal and thematic correspondences such as ברית and עולם חסדי (Isa 55:3; Ps 89:2, 4, 29, 25, 40).<sup>393</sup> Secondly, the theme of Exodus in Isa 48:12-21 could be engaged with Psalmic language in Ps 81:6-17 where Yahweh laments Israel’s failure in walking His way; ‘if Israel would walk in my ways’ (בדרכי) in Ps 81:14b; ‘leading you in the way you should walk’ (מדריךך בדרך תלך) in Isa

---

<sup>389</sup> “At least three theologically loaded terms appear both in Isaiah 40 and Psalm 90: the call for ‘comfort’/‘compassion’, and the comparison of humanity to the ‘grass’ and the ‘flower of the field’”. Jerome Creach, “The Shape of Book Four of the Psalter and the Shape of Second Isaiah,” *JSOT*, no. 80 (1998): 73–4.

<sup>390</sup> Ibid., 74.

<sup>391</sup> Paul, *Isaiah 40-66*, 56–7.

<sup>392</sup> Sommer, *Prophet*, 315–331.

<sup>393</sup> Eissfeldt argues that “in Isa 55:1-5, as elsewhere in Second Isaiah, there is no reference whatever to that which, for the author of Ps. 89, is the particular content of the promise of God to David”. See Otto Eissfeldt, “Promises of Grace to David in Isaiah 55:1-5,” in *Israel’s Prophetic Heritage; Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg* (NY: Harper, 1962), 199–200, 203. On the contrary, Willey and Sommer notice the intentional reference to Psalms 89; Willey, *Remember*, 250–5; Sommer, *Prophet*, 117–8.

48:17c.<sup>394</sup> Thirdly, the phrases in Ps 98 (cf. Ps 96) which is one of the enthronement psalms are extensively shared by Deutero-Isaiah in Isa 42:10-12 and 52:8-10.<sup>395</sup> The seven words in Isa 52:10b precisely are found in Ps 98:3b as a unique parallel in the Hebrew Bible: ראו כל־אפסי־ארץ את ישועת אלהינו ('all the ends of the earth will see the salvation of our God').<sup>396</sup> Fourthly, Isa 51:9-10 shares mythological terms and imageries such as 'Sea', 'dragon', 'Rahab', 'the great deep', 'Leviathan' from Psalms (Ps 74:12-15; 77:6, 17-21; 89:11-12; 44; 93:1-4);<sup>397</sup> also see other parallels.<sup>398</sup>

Scholars have pointed out verbal parallels between Psalms and Deutero-Isaiah to determine the literary influence of Psalms on Deutero-Isaiah or vice versa, but their decisions of the direction definitely seem to be dependent on the dating of specific psalms. Some highlight the usage of a common stock of hymnic expressions and forms as well as the possibility of the mutual dependence. At least, it is likely that Deutero-Isaiah contains the well-known hymnic styles; while there is little reason to hold the literary reference.

---

<sup>394</sup> Sommer, *Prophet*, 124–7.

<sup>395</sup> H. L. Ginsberg, "A Strand in the Cord of Hebraic Hymnody," in *W. F. Albright Volume* (Jerusalem: Jerusalem Exploration Society, 1969), 47; Tryggve N. D. Mettinger, "In Search of the Hidden Structure: YHWH as King in Isaiah 40-55," *SEÅ* 51 (1986): 156–7; Willey, *Remember*, 120–5; Concerning the use of Deutero-Isaiah's hymnic form, refer to Deming, "Hymnic Language in Deutero-Isaiah."

<sup>396</sup> Willey, *Remember*, 122; H. L. Ginsberg, "The Arm of YHWH in Isaiah 51-63 and the Text of Isa 53:10-11," *JBL* 77, no. 2 (1958): 154. However, Sommer classifies this parallel as the influence by literary genre rather than as the direct borrowing from Psalms; Sommer, *Prophet*, 109–10.

<sup>397</sup> Willey, *Remember*, 144–51.

<sup>398</sup> (1) Ps 82:5-8; Isa 40:17-23; (2) Ps 2:1-10 (Ps 72), Isa 44:24-45:8; (3) Ps 71:2-19; Isa 46:3-13; (4) Ps 37:31; Isa 51:7; (5) Ps 74:11-16; Isa 50:2-3. Willey, *Remember*.



### 3.5 The Book of Lamentations

#### 3.5.1 Job and Lamentations

The book of Lamentations designated as a lament genre has not been searched in detail for specific connections with Job and Deutero-Isaiah.<sup>399</sup> However, expressions of individual or national mourning in the book of Lamentations have been occasionally recognised as having shared verbal and thematic resemblances with Job; some argue that Lamentations might know and borrow from the text of Job,<sup>400</sup> or Job might intentionally use the texts of Lamentations.<sup>401</sup> Mettinger argues that passages in Job 16:7-17 and 19:6-12 are alluding metaphorically to Lam 3 by turning God into the place of the enemy or accuser of Job, and by depicting 'Job as standing in the place of the enemy whom God annihilates'.<sup>402</sup> The 'siege' or 'blocking' imagery of the city in Lam 3:7-9 and in Job 19:6, 8, 12 is the representative imagery which strengthens the theme of God's mistreatment of humans and of their hopelessness. The most noteworthy affinity for God's siege imagery is observed in Job 19:8 and Lam 3:6-9, 44:

אֶרְחִי גֹדֶר וְלֹא אֶעְבּוֹר וְעַל נִתְיֹבוֹתַי חֹשֶׁךְ יִשִּׁים

*He has blocked up my way, so that I cannot pass, and he has set darkness upon my paths. (Job 19:8)*

גֹּדֶר בַּעֲדֵי וְלֹא אֶצֵּא הַכְּבִיד נִחַשְׁתִּי

*He has blocked me about so that I cannot set forth; he has made my chains heavy. (Lam 3:7)*

גֹּדֶר דְּרָכֵי בְּגִזִּית נִתְיֹבְתֵי עוֹה

*He has blocked my ways with hewn stones; he has made my paths disturbed. (Lam 3:9)*

---

<sup>399</sup> William Gwaltney, "The Biblical Book of Lamentations in the Context of Near Eastern Literature," in *Scripture in Context II: More Essays on the Comparative Method*, ed. William W. Hallo, James C. Moyer, and Leo G. Perdue (IN: Eisenbrauns, 1983), 191–211; Paul Wayne Ferris, *The Genre of Communal Lament in the Bible and the Ancient Near East*, SBLDS 127 (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992); F. W. Dobbs-Allsopp, *Weep, O Daughter of Zion: A Study of the City-Lament Genre in the Hebrew Bible*, BO 44 (Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1993); Sommer, *Prophet*, 270, n.47.

<sup>400</sup> Lam 3:7-9//Job 3:23; Lam 3:12//Job 16:12-13; Lam 3:14//Job 30:9. See Dhorme, *Job*, clxxii.

<sup>401</sup> Jean Lévêque, *Job et Son Dieu: Essai D'exégèse et de Théologie Biblique* (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1970), 382–5.

<sup>402</sup> Mettinger, "Intertextuality," 274; Clines, *Job 1-20*, 442.

In many verses, Job and Lamentations are analogous, to the extent that they include common experiences of mourning and comfort. James Aitken maintains that the figure of Job on the ash heap is seen as the ‘representative of a devastated city or country’ in Lamentations (Job 2:13; Lam 2:10); he concludes that describing Job as ‘the besieged city’ without comfort shows an engagement with Jewish tradition.<sup>403</sup>

Verbal resemblances between Job and Lamentations are not as prominent as some scholars suppose the intentional reference between them to be, and moreover there are many psalms which have similar themes and motifs of suffering and loss, and which possibly adopt the genre of lament.<sup>404</sup> Thus, the prevalent influence of the genre of ‘lament’ possibly is the reasonable way of assessing resemblances between the two books.

### 3.5.2 Deutero-Isaiah and Lamentations

Scholars have suggested that the wording of Deutero-Isaiah in reference to suffering and restoration is tied up with Lamentations; other than the use of customary terms in a lament genre.<sup>405</sup> Norman Gottwald points out in respect of Löhr’s study that most resemblances are not sufficient to determine literary influence, but notices unique connections between them; claiming that ‘the many affinities between the two books often strike deeper than mere verbal parallelism’.<sup>406</sup> Mary Turner argues that female symbols in the Zion songs of Deutero-Isaiah

---

<sup>403</sup> James K. Aitken, “The Inevitability of Reading Job through Lamentations,” in *Reading Job Intertextually* (NY: T&T Clark, 2013), 215.

<sup>404</sup> Carleen Mandolfo, *Daughter Zion Talks back to the Prophets: A Dialogic Theology of the Book of Lamentations* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 58–77.

<sup>405</sup> See Norman K. Gottwald, *Studies in the Book of Lamentations*, SBT 14 (London: SCM, 1954); N. W. Porteous, “Jerusalem - Zion: The Growth of a Symbol,” in *Verbannung Und Heimkehr* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1961), 235–52; Alan L. Mintz, *Hurban: Responses to Catastrophe in Hebrew Literature* (NY: Columbia UP, 1984); Mary Donovan Turner, “Daughter Zion: Lament and Restoration” (PhD, Emory University, 1992); Tod Linafelt, “Surviving Lamentations,” *HBT* 17, no. 1 (1995): 45–61; Willey, *Remember*, 125–32, 155–71, 187–93, 214–26, 233–41; Sommer, *Prophet*, 127–30; Paul, *Isaiah 40-66*, 57–9.

<sup>406</sup> Gottwald, *Lamentations*, 44–5.

(40:1-11; 49:14-26; 50:1-3; 51:1-8; 51:9-52:12; 54:1-17) are influenced by Lamentations, 'which depicted the demise of Jerusalem through the image of the "childless" Zion'.<sup>407</sup>

Recently, Carleen Mandolfo holds that Deutero-Isaiah 'has long been recognized as a response to the pained speech of Lamentations, as well as to many other texts',<sup>408</sup> focusing on 'God's discourse' in Deutero-Isaiah (Lam 1-2; Isa 49, 51, 52, 54).<sup>409</sup> Such a concept, that the literary feature of Lamentations shaped the thought and language in Deutero-Isaiah, has led scholars to argue for a particular association between them. Let us look at some examples. A first example of resemblances appears in Lam 4:15 and Isa 52:11—סורו ('depart!'), טמא ('unclean!'), אל־תגעו ('do not touch!') (cf. Isa 52:1; Nah 2:1, Ps 98:3); Willey argues that this is a quotation of Deutero-Isaiah from Lamentations:<sup>410</sup>

סורו סורו צאו משם טמא אל־תגעו צאו מתוכה הברו נשאי כלי יהוה  
*Depart, depart, go forth from there, do not touch unclean things, go forth from its midst, purify yourselves; people who bear Yahweh's vessels! (Isa 52:11)*  
סורו טמא קראו למו סורו סורו אל־תגעו כי נצו גם־נעו אמרו בגוים לא יוסיפו לגור  
*'Go away! Unclean!' people shouted at them. 'Depart! Depart! Do not touch!' So, they fled away and wandered; and people said among the nations, 'they will stay no longer' (Lam 4:15)*

While the Judean community in exile among the nations in Lam 4:15 is treated as Zion's defiled children like lepers, Deutero-Isaiah in Isa 52:11, according to Sommer, reverses the depraved condition of the newly gathered community and depicts Babylonians as unclean.<sup>411</sup> Secondly, the motif of 'Zion's comforter' is the most prominent affinity to texts of Lamentations where the role of Yahweh as the comforter in Deutero-Isaiah reverses the mourning that there is 'no comforter' for Zion in Lamentations (Lam 1:2b, 9b-c, 16b, 17a, 21a; Isa 40:1; 49:13; 51:3, 12, 19; 54:11):<sup>412</sup>

---

<sup>407</sup> Turner, "Daughter," 219–20.

<sup>408</sup> Mandolfo, *Daughter*, 117.

<sup>409</sup> Ibid., 105.

<sup>410</sup> Also see this parallel: Lam 4:17; Isa 52:8; Willey, *Remember*, 125–7; Gottwald, *Lamentations*, 44.

<sup>411</sup> Sommer, *Prophet*, 272, 5.

<sup>412</sup> Willey, *Remember*, 130–2.

אֵין־לָהּ מִנְחָם מִכָּל־אֲהָבֶיהָ

*Among all her lovers she has none to comfort her (Lam 1:2b)*

כִּי־נָחַם יְהוָה עַמּוֹ

*For Yahweh has comforted his people (Isa 49:13c)*

כִּי־נָחַם יְהוָה צִיּוֹן נָחַם כָּל־חֲרֻבֶתֶיהָ

*For Yahweh comforts Zion; he comforts all her waste places (Isa 51:3a)*

Transformation of Lamentations' messages by Deutero-Isaiah has been regarded as the typical interpretation recurring in the relationship between the two books. For instance, the themes of the wrath of Yahweh and of the devastation of Zion's children found in Lam 2:13-19, 4:1-2 are reversed in Deutero-Isaiah where Yahweh responds to their grief and prayer in Isa 51:17-22; including the rare phrase 'at the head of every street', בראש כל־חוצות, (cf. Nah 3:10).<sup>413</sup>

Although 'Yahweh's abandonment' in several occurrences (Isa 49:14; 54:6-8, Lam 5:19-22) is likely to be a similar theme, in Deutero-Isaiah 'forgetting', 'forsaking', and 'abandoning' his people is momentary and is immediately answered (Isa 49:15; 54:7);<sup>414</sup> for other similarities, see footnote.<sup>415</sup>

Overall, Job, Deutero-Isaiah, and Lamentations could probably share the genre 'lament' and the imagery of the devastated city, in order to describe the present suffering of an individual or the exiled community.

---

<sup>413</sup> Ibid., 160; Sommer, *Prophet*, 129–30.

<sup>414</sup> Willey, *Remember*, 189–93, 233–9. Cf., Linafelt argues "that Isa 49:14-26 is in fact a direct answer to Lamentations, and that it is generated by the same concern for survival" and proposes a verbal parallel as quotation from Lam 5:20 to Isa 49:14. See Linafelt, "Surviving Lamentations," 56; also see *Surviving Lamentations: Catastrophe, Lament, and Protest in the Afterlife of a Biblical Book* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000).

<sup>415</sup> Five more motifs suggested by Willey "comforter" (Isa 51:11-12; Lam 1:1-4) (p. 155-158) (Isa 49:13; Lam 1:9) (p. 188); Zion's humiliation (Lam 1-3; Isa 52:1-2; 47) (p. 165-171); "servant" (Isa 50:4-11; 52:13-53:12; Lam 3:25-30) (p. 214-221); the comparison between Daughter Zion and the Servant of Yahweh (geber) (Lam 1-3) (p. 221-226); "sacred stones" (Lam 4:1-2; Isa 54:11-13) (p. 239-241); Willey, *Remember*.

### 3.6 Other Prophetic Books

#### 3.6.1 Job and Prophetic Books

Other prophetic books have a variety of affinities with the book of Job, although, unlike the case of Jeremiah, those affinities between them are not overwhelming. First, it has been argued that the book of Amos shares a significant proportion of common language, styles, and themes which are indicated in wisdom literature such as the book of Job; e.g., ‘consecutive numerals’ in Amos 1:3, 6, 9, 11, 13; 2:1, 4, 6 and Job 33:14.<sup>416</sup> Especially, Crenshaw argues that specific words (בלג, שחור, צלמות, צלמות) in the doxologies of Amos (Amos 4:13; 5:6, 8, 10; 9:5-6) strikingly overlap with the hymnic language in Job 5:9-16 and 9:5-10.<sup>417</sup> He adds that the theophanic language in Job, where Yahweh emerges as Creator of the universe, has similarities with that of Amos (Amos 5:17; 7:8; 8:12, 11-14).<sup>418</sup> It is worth mentioning the parallel in Job 9:8-9 (cf. 38:31) and Amos 4:13, 5:8a:<sup>419</sup>

וְדֹרֶךְ עַל־בִּמְתֵּי יָם עָשָׂה־עֵשׂ כִּסִּיל וְכִימָה וְחֲדָרֵי תִמָּן  
*He trampled on the waves of sea. He is the one who made the Bear, Orion, and the Pleiades, and the circle of the southern wind. (Job 9:8b-9)*  
וְדֹרֶךְ עַל־בִּמְתֵּי אֶרֶץ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי־צִבְאוֹת שָׁמוֹ  
*He is the one who trampled on the heights of the earth (Amos 4:13d)*  
עָשָׂה כִּימָה וְכִסִּיל  
*He is the One who made the Pleiades and Orion (Amos 5:8a)*

Contrary to the influence of the wisdom tradition on the doxologies of the book of Amos, Hilary Marlow insists on the influence of the prophetic tradition or of the text of Amos on Job and presents two possibilities; the intentional dependence (Job 9:9; 38:31-32; Amos 5:8) and the broad influence of prophetic source (Job 9:5-10; Amos 8; Job 11; Amos 9).<sup>420</sup> She says that

---

<sup>416</sup> Samuel L. Terrien, “Amos and Wisdom,” in *Studies in Ancient Israelite Wisdom*, ed. James L. Crenshaw, LBS (NY: Ktav, 1976), 448–55; James L. Crenshaw, “The Influence of the Wise upon Amos: The Doxologies of Amos and Job 5:9-16, 9:5-10,” *ZAW* 79, no. 1 (1967): 42–52.

<sup>417</sup> See Crenshaw, “Influence,” 49–50.

<sup>418</sup> See *ibid.*, 51.

<sup>419</sup> Hartley, *Job*, 12; Crenshaw, “Influence,” 49–50; Hilary Marlow, “Creation Themes in Job and Amos: An Intertextual Relationship?,” in *Reading Job Intertextually* (NY: T&T Clark, 2013), 147–8.

<sup>420</sup> Marlow, “Amos.”

while the resemblances between Amos and Job are derived from the broad ‘references to the non-human natural world both earthly and cosmological’,<sup>421</sup> ‘the language and themes of Amos are re-used or re-worked by the author of Job’.<sup>422</sup>

Except for the books of Jeremiah and Amos, verbal and thematic parallels with other prophetic books are unlikely to be many in common; Hartley gives parallels only with Hosea and Malachi, and Dhorme suggests a few links with Zechariah and Malachi.<sup>423</sup> In the book of Zechariah, Zech 1-8—apart from Zech 9-14 which is assumably dated to the post-exilic period in origin—has been discussed to have links with the prologue of Job 1-2. Because of the use of the definite article ahead of a personal name שָׁטָן (הַשָּׂטָן; Zech 3:1-2; Job 1:6-9, 12; 2:1-7) different with 1 Chr 21:1, scholars have believed that there is a contact point between Zechariah and Job 1-2, and have proposed that the author of Job adopts the reference of ‘the Satan’ from texts of Zechariah.<sup>424</sup> In recent study, however, Michael Stead argues that ‘the book of Job must be the cause of the semantic development of the word שָׁטָן’ in Zechariah, ‘since the Satan of Zech 3 is not described using the root שָׁטָן’ (‘to robe’; cf. Job 1:7). He proceeds to the intertextual study based on the priority of Job 1-2 over Zechariah and suggests the deliberate allusion of Zechariah 1 to Job 1-2; e.g., (1) the expression, the horses and chariots go out ‘to present themselves before the Lord’ (מִהֲתִיצֵב עַל־אֲדֹנָי) in Zech 6:5, is compared to verses in Job 1:6

---

<sup>421</sup> Ibid., 144.

<sup>422</sup> The following are possible parallels between Amos and Job: first, two correspondences in Job 9:8, 38:31-32 and Amos 5:8 make strong parallels (“Orion and ‘Pleiades’”). The second noteworthy passage is Job 9:8 // Amos 4:13 (‘treading on the high places’), Job 9:6//Amos 8:8 (‘who shakes the earth out of its place’). The third commonality in shared vocabularies and themes is the use of the verb הִפֹּךְ (‘overturn’) and of the wording group to express darkness such as חֹשֶׁךְ, צִלְמוֹת (Job 9:5; 12:5//Amos 5:8). Job 11:7-11 and Amos 9:1-4 describe in slightly different ways God’s nature as “undiscoverable” by humans in Job and “the impossibility of hiding from God’s punishment” in Amos. The final common motif is God’s nature to direct “the forces of nature” and to manifest God’s anger “through the power of nature.” Ibid., 154.

<sup>423</sup> I refer to the following commentaries: Cheyne, *Job*, 87; Dhorme, *Job*, clxvii–clxviii; Hartley, *Job*, 12.

<sup>424</sup> See Dhorme, *Job*, clxvii; Jean Lévêque, “La Datation Du Livre de Job,” in *Congress Volume: Vienna, 1980*, ed. John Adney Emerton, SVT v. 32 (Leiden: Brill, 1981), 206–19; Hurvitz, “Date of the Prose-Tale.”

and 2:1 where the heavenly beings ‘present themselves before Yahweh’ (להתיצב על־יְהוָה); (2) the expression, ‘patrolling the earth’ (להתהלך בארץ) that describes the role of horses in Zech 1:10-11 makes a parallel with Job 1:7 and 2:2 which describe ‘the Satan’ as roaming and patrolling the earth (בארץ ומהתהלך בה).<sup>425</sup>

One may mention the reference of the name אִיּוֹב as the paragon of the pious man with Noah and Daniel (Ezek 14:14, 20); in Ezek 14:12-23, God declares the inescapable judgment of Jerusalem, and, although the most pious heroes were present, their righteousness will not save people. However, the indication of the name אִיּוֹב alone does not guarantee a literary link between Job and Ezekiel. Paul Joyce, for instance, insists that ‘the reference of the three paragons in Ezek 14 is proverbial in tone, and it is likely that Ezekiel is alluding to an old tradition including a virtuous hero Job’;<sup>426</sup> he also examines other parallels; e.g., four reports by messengers in Job 1:13-19 and four patterns of punishments in Ezek 14:13-19. The paucity of verbal parallels, when considering the substantial scale of both books, and the lack of precise analogy could not convince us to argue the literary relationship between Job and Ezekiel.

James Nogalski reads together dialogues of Job and Bildad in Job 8-10 with the context of Joel 1-2 through the dynamic usage of the verb שׁוּב.<sup>427</sup> He designates two competing views; in Job ‘as a protest literature’ and in Joel standing on the prophetic tradition alongside Hosea.<sup>428</sup> The meaning of שׁוּב in Job’s reply (Job 9-10) involves death, while in Joel 2:12-14 it contains the

---

<sup>425</sup> Michael R. Stead, *The Intertextuality of Zechariah 1-8*, LHB/OTS 506 (NY; London: T&T Clark, 2009), 87, 208; also see Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer, “A Busy Night in the Heavenly Court,” *SEA* 71 (2006): 190.

<sup>426</sup> Paul M. Joyce, “‘Even If Noah, Daniel, and Job Were in It...’ (Ezekiel 14:14): The Case of Job and Ezekiel,” in *Reading Job Intertextually* (NY: T&T Clark, 2013), 127.

<sup>427</sup> James D. Nogalski, “Job and Joel: Divergent Voice on a Common Theme,” in *Reading Job Intertextually* (NY: T&T Clark, 2013), 129–41.

<sup>428</sup> It is suggested that while “Bildad and Joel represent, in many respects, the dominant theological perspective of Deuteronomy and Proverbs”, “Job serves as an important corrective in this respect to the dominant theological voices in the Torah, the Prophets, and the Writings”. See *ibid.*, 141.

hope with the request of repentance.<sup>429</sup> In this synchronic reading through the conversation of three figures—Job, Bildad, and Joel—Nogalski argues that Job critically understands the traditional theology imposed by the Book of the Twelve.

Lastly, the prophetic books which are mentioned by commentators as having affinities with Job are the books of Hosea and Malachi.<sup>430</sup> Verbal affinities between Job and Hosea/Malachi, however, are scarce, and if there are resemblances between them, those affinities seem to be prevalent in other biblical books. For instance, Dhorme reckons that Malachi alludes to Job from the expression of fearing Yahweh in Malachi; יִרְאֵי יְהוָה in Mal 3:16 (x 2); וִירְאָה אֱלֹהִים in Job 1:1.<sup>431</sup> However, this parallel is no more than a commonplace. The book of Hosea is hardly argued as having the direct dependence of Job; instead scholars look for the general influence of wisdom form and thought on Hosea.<sup>432</sup>

### 3.6.2 Deutero-Isaiah and Prophetic Books

What of similarities in Deutero-Isaiah and the rest of other prophetic books? Resemblances with them, in fact, are not as prominent as those between Deutero-Isaiah and Jeremiah or First/Third Isaiah; parallels with Jeremiah seem to be more significant to the formation of Deutero-Isaiah than the parallels with other prophetic books.<sup>433</sup> Nevertheless, there are

---

<sup>429</sup> Ibid., 134–5.

<sup>430</sup> Hartley suggests two cases in Hosea: כַּכְפִּיר (like a lion) in Hos 5:14, 13:7, 8; Job 10:16; Hos 6:1//Job 5:18 (cf. Deut 32:39; Isa 30:26). In Malachi: Mal 2:10a // Job 31:15). See Hartley, *Job*, 12.

<sup>431</sup> Dhorme, *Job*, clxviii.

<sup>432</sup> Dell says that in Hosea, “there are some passages that use wisdom forms, more predominantly there are those with wisdom content and there may be some with a wisdom context”; Katharine J. Dell, “Hosea, Creation, and Wisdom. An Alternative Tradition,” in *On Stone and Scroll*, ed. James K. Aitken, vol. 420 (Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, 2011), 423; also refer to A. A. Macintosh, “Hosea and the Wisdom Tradition: Dependence and Independence,” in *Wisdom in Ancient Israel*, ed. John Day (Cambridge University, 1998), 124–32. Nevertheless, she disagrees with the theory of Raymond C. Van Leeuwen, “Scribal Wisdom and Theodicy in the Book of the Twelve,” in *In Search of Wisdom* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993), 31–49, which argues that there is a wisdom modification across the minor prophetic books.

<sup>433</sup> See Sommer’s conclusion. He states that the literary affinity of Jeremiah (thirteen-nine allusions) is stronger than that of First Isaiah (twenty-four allusions). Sommer, *Prophet*, 105–7.



overlapping connections between Deutero-Isaiah and other prophetic books which might suggest that there was a literary contact between them. Indeed, although some of the books are much smaller than Jeremiah, the frequency of connections with Deutero-Isaiah is no less than that of the book of Jeremiah.

For instance, the book of Nahum which consists of three chapters has eight remarkable verbal parallels with Deutero-Isaiah.<sup>434</sup> Verbal patterns in the motif of the downfall of Assyria and the deliverance of Judah are shared with Deutero-Isaiah which refers to Babylonian destiny; see Nah 2:1 [Eng 1:15] and Isa 52:1, 7:<sup>435</sup>

הנה על־ההרים רגלי מבשר משמיע שלום חגי יהודה חגיך שלמי נדריך כי לא יוסיף  
עוד לעבר־בך בליעל כלה נכרת

*Behold, upon the mountains the feet of the one bringing good news, announcing peace! Celebrate your festivals, O Judah. Fulfil your vows, because never again will the worthless go through<sup>436</sup> you. He is completely cut off (Nah 2:1; [Eng 1:15])*

מה נאוו על־ההרים רגלי מבשר משמיע שלום מבשר טוב משמיע ישועה אמר לציון  
מלך אלהיך

*How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of the one bringing good news, announcing peace, bringing good news of joy, announcing salvation, who says to Zion, 'Your God is reigning'. (Isa 52:7)*

ירושלם עיר הקדש כי לא יוסיף יבא־בך עוד ערל וטמא  
*Jerusalem, the holy city! For the uncircumcised and the unclean will never again enter you. (Isa 52:1b)*

For another example, the book of Zephaniah (a small scale of three chapters), which is probably close to the period of the seventh-century prophet Nahum also brings important parallels with Deutero-Isaiah. According to Cassuto, Sommer and Shalom, Zeph 2:13-15 in which the prophet declares the total destruction of foreign countries, is alluded by Deutero-Isaiah (Isa 47:8-10); in particular, it is argued that Zeph 2:15 is used by Deutero-Isaiah (Isa 47:8).<sup>437</sup> In addition,

<sup>434</sup> Cassuto proposes the following list of parallels: (1) Isa 42:10-11; Nah 1:5; (2) Isa 47:2-3; Nah 3:5; (3) Isa 50:2; Nah 1:4; (4) Isa 51:19; Nah 3:7; (5) Isa 51:20; Nah 3:10; (6) Isa 52:1, 7; Nah 2:1. See Cassuto, "Formal," 168-9.

<sup>435</sup> See *ibid.*, 169; Sommer, *Prophet*, 82-3; Paul, *Isaiah* 40-66, 56.

<sup>436</sup> K, לעבור; Q, לעבר (Qal infinitive construct).

<sup>437</sup> Cassuto, "Formal," 172-4; Sommer, *Prophet*, 252; Paul, *Isaiah* 40-66, 56.

Cassuto proposes other connections in Zeph 3:14-20 and passages in Isa 40-66,<sup>438</sup> but as Sommer pointed out, the possibility of the literary dependence is so weak, because those similarities are very commonplace, and the third chapter of Zephaniah has been dealt with as exilic prophecies.<sup>439</sup>

Another prophetic book having the similarities with Deutero-Isaiah is the book of Ezekiel.

Cassuto lists two different groups of parallels between the two books; the first group of parallels is common not only to the two books, but also in earlier writings, mostly Jeremiah, so that they are probably to depend on the texts of Jeremiah rather than those of Ezekiel (e.g., Isa 40:11//Jer 31:10//Ezek 34:12; Isa 46:2//Jer 22:22; 30:16//Ezek 12:11; 30:17; 20:18); the second group of parallels occurs only in the two books and this might support the particular connection between them (Isa 40:5; 49:26//Ezek 21:4, 10; Isa 48:11//Ezek 20:9, 14, 22; Isa 52:10//Ezek 5:8; 20:9, 14, 22, 41; 22:16; 28:25; 38:23; 39:27).<sup>440</sup> Due to these links in the second group, interpreters often argue that Deutero-Isaiah, though its scope is very small, is dependent on texts from Ezekiel.<sup>441</sup> The most significant parallel occurs in Isa 48:11 and Ezek 20:9, 14, 22, including the verbal pattern about God's persistent action for the sake of his name, which may be seen as follows:

למעני למעני אעשה כי איך יחל וכבודי לאחר לא־אתן  
*For my sake, for my sake, I will act, for how should my glory be profaned?<sup>442</sup> I  
 will not give it to another. (Isa 48:11)*

<sup>438</sup> (1) Zeph 3:14; Isa 44:23; 49:13; 54:1; (2) Zeph 3:15 Isa 49:17; (3) Zeph 3:16//Isa 41:10, 14; 43:1, 5; 44:2 (cf. Jer 30:10-11); (4) Zeph 3:20//Isa 43:5. See Cassuto, "Formal," 176-7.

<sup>439</sup> Sommer, *Prophet*, 104, 256.

<sup>440</sup> Cassuto, "Formal," 160-8.

<sup>441</sup> Joel Kenneth Eakins, "Ezekiel's Influence on the Exilic Isaiah" (ThD, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1970); See Dieter Baltzer, *Ezechiel Und Deuterjesaja: Berührungen in Der Heilserwartung Der Beiden Grossen Exilspropheten*, BZAW 121 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1971); Sommer, *Prophet*, 104.

<sup>442</sup> LXX (NRSV) read this part as "because my name be profaned?; I will not give my glory to another" (LXE) assuming the original text omitted "my name". 1QIsa and 4QIsd read this as having the first person verb of חלל; "how shall I be profaned?" But, both proposals lack enough explanation to support them. And Tg and Vulg follow MT and in this case MT is likely to be more original. In this case, the

ואעש למען שמי לבלתי החל לעיני הגוים אשר־המה בתוכם  
*But I acted for my name's sake, so that it should not be profaned in the sight of the nations among whom they lived (Ezek 20:9a)*

ואעשה למען שמי לבלתי החל לעיני הגוים אשר הוצאתים לעיניהם  
*But I acted for my name's sake, so that it should not be profaned in the sight of my name in whose sight I brought them out (Ezek 20:14)*

והשבתי את־ידי ואעש למען שמי לבלתי החל לעיני הגוים אשר־הוצאתי אותם לעיניהם  
*But I hold back my hand and acted for my name's sake, so that it should not be profaned in the sight of the nations, in whose sight I brought them (Ezek 20:22)*

Other than Nahum, Zephaniah, and Ezekiel, interpreters do not include on the intertextual list of Deuter-Isaiah the later books such as Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, while scholars suggest a few connections with books such as Hosea and Micah. For instance, Shalom proposes the literary connection between Deutero-Isaiah and Hosea from the common motif of ‘the married woman’ (Zion) who was deserted by her husband, but to whom Yahweh will restore his commitment; e.g., Hos 1:6; 2:21, 25//Isa 54:7-8, 10; Hos 2:20//Isa 54:10 (ברית); Hos 2:18 (בעלי)//Isa 54:5 (בעליך)); in addition, he argues that the name לֹא־רָחֵמָה in Hos 1:6 and 2:25 ‘may also have influenced Deutero-Isaiah’s phraseology’ לֹא־נִחַמָה in Isa 54:11.<sup>443</sup> Sommer interprets these resemblances as ‘a reversal (of Hosea’s prophecy of doom)’ (Hos 2:6; Isa 54:1, 13), ‘a conformation (that a disaster indeed concurred)’ (Hos 2:19; Isa 54:8), and ‘a reprediction (of Hosea’s prophecy of reconciliation between YHWH and Israel)’ (Hos 2:1).<sup>444</sup> However, it is important to notice that those affinities between Hos 2 and Isa 54 could be found in Lamentations and Ps 89.<sup>445</sup> Though a few similarities between Deutero-Isaiah and Micah (Isa 51:3-5; Mic 4:1-4 (cf. Isa 2:1-4))<sup>446</sup> or Hosea (Isa 43:10-11; Hos 13:4)<sup>447</sup> are proposed, it would

---

word, וכבודי, which appears in the third colon after the phrase, כי איך יחל, could be the subject of the second colon; “for how should by glory be profaned?” Goldingay supports this rendering. See Goldingay, *Isaiah vol.2*, 134–5. Oswalt renders this as “for how could it be profaned?” See Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah*, 265.

<sup>443</sup> Paul, *Isaiah 40-66*, 416–7.

<sup>444</sup> Sommer, *Prophet*, 103.

<sup>445</sup> Paul, *Isaiah 40-66*, 416–7.

<sup>446</sup> Sommer, *Prophet*, 79.

<sup>447</sup> Sommer suggests Ginsberg’s example as a questionable case of allusion; *Ibid.*, 256.

be hard to maintain a certain literary reference, but instead it would be reasonable to consider an influence of prophetic tradition.

### 3.7 *Other Wisdom Books*

Literary relations between Job and Proverbs/Ecclesiastes have been widely studied in the framework of the wisdom literature. However, interpreters have hardly discussed similarities between Deutero-Isaiah and Proverbs/Ecclesiastes;<sup>448</sup> by contrast, attention has been paid to the literary influence between Proverbs and First Isaiah.<sup>449</sup>

#### 3.7.1 Job and Proverbs

It has been said that what the book of Proverbs among the wisdom corpus teaches and states is quite different from Job's view. For instance, Suzanne Boorer regards Proverbs as forming the dualistic view between life and death, but Job as having the non-dualistic notion.<sup>450</sup> According to Boorer, on the one hand, Prov 1-9 may be described from two groups of words of 'life/living' (חַיִּים, חַיָּה; Prov 3:2; 7:2), and of 'death/dying/Sheol' (מָוֶת, שְׁאוֹל; 2:18; 5:5; 7:27); they are also symbolised as the personified Wisdom (or the 'Woman Wisdom') (3:18, 22; 8:35; 9:6) and as the 'Strange Woman' (2:18; 5:5; 7:27; 9:18). On the other hand, she argues that Job has no symbol of the 'Strange Woman', but instead embodies the idea of chaos into 'Sea', 'Behemoth', 'Leviathan' (Job 3:8; 7:12; 38:8; 40:15-41:34); Yahweh's speech in terms of symbols of life and death reflects 'a universe and view of reality that is paradoxical and non-dualistic'.<sup>451</sup>

---

<sup>448</sup> Willey and Sommer do not particularly mention the inner-biblical connections with Proverbs, Job, and Ecclesiastes.

<sup>449</sup> Johannes Fichtner, "Isaiah among the Wise," in *Studies in Ancient Israelite Wisdom*, ed. James L. Crenshaw, LBS (NY: Ktav, 1976), 434-6; also see J. William Whedbee, *Isaiah & Wisdom* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1971).

<sup>450</sup> Suzanne Boorer, "A Matter of Life and Death: A Comparison of Proverbs 1-9 and Job," in *Prophets and Paradigms: Essays in Honor of Gene M. Tucker*, ed. Stephen Breck Reid and Gene M. Tucker, JSOT 229 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 187-204.

<sup>451</sup> *Ibid.*, 196.

Also, similarities between Job and Proverbs have been found to maintain the literary relationship by commentators.<sup>452</sup> At first, the most frequently mentioned parallel occurs between Prov 3:11-12 and Job 5:17 (e.g., Cheyne, Dhorme, Hartley, and Crenshaw):

הנה אֲשֶׁרִי אֲנוֹשׁ יִכְחַנוּ אֱלֹהִים וּמוֹסֵר שְׁדֵי אֱלֹהִים  
*Behold, happy is the man whom God reproves; therefore do not reject the discipline of the Shaddai. (Job 5:17)*

מוֹסֵר יְהוָה בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים וְאֵל־תִּקֶּץ בְּתוֹכָהֶם כִּי אֵת אֲשֶׁר יֶאֱהָב יְהוָה יוֹכִיחַ וְכֹאֵב אֶת־בֶּן יִרְצֶה  
*My son, do not reject the discipline of Yahweh nor despise his reproof, for Yahweh reproves him whom he loves, as a father does to the child in whom he delights. (Prov 3:11-12)*

Dhorme argues from this parallel that the passage of Job depends on or quotes the text of Proverbs; Prov 21:17//Job 18:5-6; Prov 8:39//Job 38:10-11.<sup>453</sup> However, Crenshaw proposes that those recurring similarities are probably derived from a common traditional source about divine discipline inherited from earlier texts (Job 5:17-18; Prov 3:11-12; Deut 32:39), because these connections express the general subject-matter of divine favour and love in suffering (cf. Job 33:15-30 and Deut 8:5).<sup>454</sup>

Secondly, scholars suggest the connection between the hymns, exalting ‘personified Wisdom’ in Prov 3, 8 and the poem of wisdom, praising values of incomparable and inaccessible wisdom in Job 28 (e.g. Prov 3:14-15; 8:11, 19//Job 28:15-19; Prov 3:19-20; 8:22-31// Job 28:23-7).<sup>455</sup> Shimon Bakon, comparing two hymns in Prov8 and Job 28, points out, from two final verses about the admonition of wisdom and evil (Prov 8:13; Job 28:28), that the answer ‘to the ultimate question is almost identical’.<sup>456</sup> Especially, Prov 8 has remarkable linguistic links with

<sup>452</sup> Cheyne, *Job*, 85; Dhorme, *Job*, clxv–clxvi; Hartley, *Job*, 11.

<sup>453</sup> Dhorme, *Job*, clxv–clxvi.

<sup>454</sup> James L. Crenshaw, “Divine Discipline in Job 5:17-18, Proverbs 3:11-12, Deuteronomy 32:39, and Beyond,” in *Reading Job Intertextually* (NY: T&T Clark, 2013), 176–89.

<sup>455</sup> Dhorme, *Job*, clxvi; Hartley, *Job*, 11.

<sup>456</sup> Shimon Bakon, “Two Hymns to Wisdom: Proverbs 8 and Job 28,” *JBQ* 36, no. 4 (2008): 229.

passages of Job (Prov 8:14//Job 12:13; Prov 8:25b//Job 15:7b; Prov 8:27b//Job 26:10b; Prov 8:29//Job 38:10); see this instance:

*Before the mountains had been shaped, before the hills, I was brought forth*  
(לפני גבעות חוללת) (Prov 8:25)  
*"Are you the first man who was born? Or were you brought forth before the hills?"*  
(ולפני גבעות חוללת) (Job 15:7)

Lastly, correspondents may be found in expressions in the saying of Agur—Prov 30:4//Job 26:8; 38:5; Prov 30:14//Job 29:17—and in the motif of the fate of the wicked—Prov 13:9; 18:5-6; 24:20//Job 20:26; 21:17. For instance, Dhorme mentions that ‘Job 26:8 and 38:5 answer the questions of Agur in Pr 30:4, and that the image of Job 29:17 is inspired by that of Agur in Pr 30:14’.<sup>457</sup> However, the possibility of the literary contact between Job and Proverbs remains unclear in that they have different views on justice and suffering.

### 3.7.2 Job and Ecclesiastes

The book of Ecclesiastes which would have sceptical thoughts against traditional ‘wisdom’ has been treated as having resemblances with the book of Job. For example, Dhorme proposes five shared imageries and one proverbial form (Job 1:21//Eccl 5:14; Job 3:16//Eccl 6:4-5; Job 9:12//Eccl 8:4; Job 14:21-2//Eccl 9:5-6; Job 34:14//Eccl 12:7; Job 38:24//Eccl 11:5)<sup>458</sup>; Antoon Schoors notices three verbal connections (Eccl 3:20; 12:7a//Job 34:14-15; Eccl 5:14a//Job 1:21a; Eccl 8:4//Job 9:12);<sup>459</sup> and Thomas Krüger interprets passages of Ecclesiastes in the light of the book of Job (Eccl 4:1-3; 5:12-6:6; 6:10; 7:15-20; 8:10-15) as a source text.<sup>460</sup> The most

---

<sup>457</sup> Dhorme, *Job*, clxvi.

<sup>458</sup> Ibid., clxxii–clxxiii.

<sup>459</sup> Antoon Schoors, “(Mis)use of Intertextuality in Qoheleth Exegesis,” in *Congress Volume* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 46–7.

<sup>460</sup> Krüger, however, concludes that “reading Ecclesiastes intertextually” with Job “is worth the trouble”. See Thomas Krüger, “Reading Ecclesiastes Intertextually - Ecclesiastes and Job” (presented at the SBL International Meeting, Amsterdam, 2012).

frequently cited verbal connection between the two books appears in Job 1:21 and Eccl 5:14 [Eng. 5:15] to describe the motif of ‘Mother Earth’:<sup>461</sup>

וַיֹּאמֶר עֶרְם יֵצְתִי [יֵצְאֹתִי] מִבֶּטֶן אִמִּי וְעֶרְם אָשׁוּב שְׁמָה יְהוָה נָתַן וַיְהוֶה לִקְחָהּ יְהוָה מִבֶּרֶךְ  
*And he said, “Naked I came out of my mother's womb, and naked I will return there. Yahweh has given, and Yahweh has taken; blessed be the name of Yahweh.” (Job 1:21)*  
 כֹּאשֶׁר יֵצָא מִבֶּטֶן אִמּוֹ עֶרְוֹם יָשׁוּב לֵלְכַת כְּשָׁבָא וּמֵאֻמָּה לֹא־יֵשֵׂא בְעִמְלּוֹ שִׁילָךְ בִּידּוֹ  
*As he came out of his mother's womb, naked he shall return to go again, as he came, and will take nothing for his labour that he may carry away in his hand. (Eccl 5:14 [Eng. 5:15])*

Recently, Richard Schultz has reexamined Dhorme’s parallel lists; Job 1:21//Eccl 5:14(15); Job 3:16//Eccl 6:3b-5; Job 9:12//Eccl 8:4; Job 34:14-15//Eccl 12:7; 3:20 (cf. Ps 104:29b; Gen 3:19). Schultz on the one hand proposes reading Job in the light of verbal parallels in Ecclesiastes, but on the other hand he concludes that, though there is no reason to deny the probability of the intentional use of a text by author(s), it is hardly possible to demonstrate it. I admit Schultz’s reading; saying that Job and Ecclesiastes ‘stand in solidarity against overly optimistic views of the benefits of wisdom and wise living.’<sup>462</sup>

### 3.8 Conclusion

The possible associations between Job/Deutero-Isaiah and other books of the Hebrew Bible have been considered, and it has been confirmed that resemblances are many and varied. These correlations of Job and of Deutero-Isaiah indicate that they are not restricted to any single source and to a literary tradition. On the one hand, the book of Job has the closest resemblances with Jeremiah and Lamentations in prophetic books and with Psalms, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes in Hebrew poetry. Among minor prophetic texts, except for Amos, the overlapped

---

<sup>461</sup> Concerning the debate over “Mother Earth” formula, refer to Gregory Vall, “The Enigma of Job 1,21a,” *Biblica* 76, no. 3 (1995): 325–42; Dhorme, *Job*, clxxii; Schoors, “(Mis)use,” 47; Richard L. Schultz, “Job and Ecclesiastes: Intertextuality and a Protesting Pair,” in *Reading Job Intertextually* (NY: T&T Clark, 2013), 193–5.

<sup>462</sup> Schultz says that both Job and Ecclesiastes in canon together propose themes of wisdom and folly and of “the divine origin and relative but limited value of wisdom”, where Job’s emphasis is on divine wisdom, and Ecclesiastes’ on human efforts to employ it. See Schultz, “Job-Ecclesiastes,” 203.

links with Zechariah 1-8, Ezekiel, Joel 1-2, Hosea, and Malachi are not enough to establish a literary relationship with Job. It is interesting to note that Job does not evince many resemblances with the first and third part of Isaiah. In addition, it should not be overlooked that the texts of Deuteronomy and the priestly texts (esp. Genesis) have by far the broadest influence on the formation of the book of Job; whether Job is supportive or critical of their traditional theology. On the other hand, in the case of Deutero-Isaiah, linguistic and thematic affinities with First and Third Isaiah are found overwhelmingly. But, as Sommer pointed out,<sup>463</sup> parallels between Deutero-Isaiah and Jeremiah are no less than those between Deutero-Isaiah and First Isaiah. Passages in Lamentations, Nahum, Zephaniah, and Ezekiel show considerable links with Deutero-Isaiah; verbal parallels with Micah and Hosea would be too weak to say the literary relationship. Furthermore, the intra-biblical study of Deutero-Isaiah has also concentrated on the Pentateuch and the deuteronomistic texts. Many have also focused on the commonality between Psalms and Deutero-Isaiah, but differing with Job, literary associations between Deutero-Isaiah and Proverbs/Ecclesiastes have scarcely been treated.

Based on what we have observed, we need to ask: Is the literary relationship between Job and Deutero-Isaiah more distinctive than the relationships between Job or Deutero-Isaiah and other biblical books? This has proved not to be so for the following four reasons. First, when comparing the amount and type of shared vocabulary between Job/Deutero-Isaiah and other books, verbal connections between Job and Deutero-Isaiah turn out to be in no way unusual and extraordinary at all. The quantity of unique and rare verbal clusters shared by Job or Deutero-Isaiah and other texts would be sufficient to claim that there might be distinctive literary relationships between Job/Deutero-Isaiah and other biblical materials. On the one hand, even more striking correspondences have been noted between the Psalms and Job than verbal connections between Job and Deutero-Isaiah so that we may say that the original association

---

<sup>463</sup> Sommer, "New."



with the Psalms texts is much more distinctive than any other relationships. On the other hand, Deutero-Isaiah primarily has the most dominant connections with Psalms in the Hebrew Bible and coherently shares more terms with the prophetic books than resemblances with the book of Job. It is apparent that the book which has the most significant linguistic commonalities with Job and Deutero-Isaiah by far is the book of Jeremiah, so much so that one might maintain that either the relationship between Jeremiah and Job or between Jeremiah and Deutero-Isaiah is more distinguishing than that between Job and Deutero-Isaiah. In addition, Job and Deutero-Isaiah commonly designate a large amount of shared phraseology connected with the priestly and deuteronomistic documents.

Secondly, the same conclusion may emerge from the common literary forms and styles between Job and Deutero-Isaiah. There is only a little distinctiveness in forms and styles which Job and Deutero-Isaiah commonly hold, compared with other connections. What we can affirm is that shared forms and genres are not exclusive features, but that they are fashioned by prevalent literary traditions which can be easily found in other materials. For instance, technical forms of 'lament' genre commonly appear in Lamentations and Psalms as well as in Job and Deutero-Isaiah. The most frequently mentioned genres may be found in the hymnic and the disputational forms, but the form of a hymn is commonplace such as in Psalms, Lamentations, and Amos, and the disputational and legal forms are broadly employed in prophetic books. It would be hard to determine which literary genres and forms in specific texts of Job and Deutero-Isaiah are even more original than other correspondents.

Thirdly, common motifs and themes intertwined with these verbal similarities can be considered. In fact, we have already confirmed in Chapter 2 that common themes found elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible cannot alone be evidence to indicate a literary connection between Job and Deutero-Isaiah. When comparing amounts and types of common themes, it is certain in many cases that there would be no distinctiveness in common themes between Job and Deutero-Isaiah other than general themes which can be found in other associations. Many

relationships between Job/Deutero-Isaiah and other books have as many similar motifs and themes as those between Job and Deutero-Isaiah. For instance, the most prominently mentioned similarity in the two books would be the imagery of the mythological figures (Rahab, Sea, Sea-dragon, etc) in the divine battle and the creation account. However, they also appear in passages of Gen 1-2 and the Psalmic texts, so that it would not be possible to suppose that this shows a distinctive relationship between the two books. Moreover, the subject-matter of the suffering individual seems to be more distinct and original in the figure of the prophet Jeremiah than that in Job and Deutero-Isaiah. Accordingly, while it is true that Job shares some motifs and subject-matter with Deutero-Isaiah, both texts share the same motifs and themes with other biblical materials as well.

To sum up, similarities between Job and Deutero-Isaiah are no more striking and numerous than those between Job/Deutero-Isaiah and other biblical books. It has shown that while linguistic correspondences of Job with Jeremiah, Psalms, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes are more abundant than those with any other books in the Hebrew Bible, Deutero-Isaiah exhibits more affinities with Jeremiah, Psalms and First/Third Isaiah than with any other books. Therefore, we can conclude that we have little reason to argue that the relation between Job and Deutero-Isaiah is more remarkable than Job's or Deutero-Isaiah's affinities with other writings. Furthermore, by looking at overlapped links and associations in Job and Deutero-Isaiah, this study offers a new perspective on interconnectedness in the Hebrew Bible. Namely, various resemblances may uncover a very wide-ranging network of links, which may tie some books together closely, extending across almost all the poetic materials, and even much of the prose of the Old Testament. In this sense, 'intertextuality' in biblical materials should not be a methodology to establish direct literary relationships, but needs to be seen as a product of the compound knowledge which may appear in an infinite range of sources.

## **Part II Scribal Culture in Job and Deutero-Isaiah**

## Chapter 4 Scribes and Scribal Culture

The discussion of interconnections between biblical texts has often been dominated by a perception, that resemblances or interrelations between wisdom literature and other biblical texts are nowhere better illustrated than in the long-running debates about ‘wisdom influence’ on other literature. To the extent that we focus on the particular groups that produced individual texts or certain types of text, we also create a need to explain literary interconnections in terms of interactions between those groups or circles. In this chapter, I wish to propose that it is more helpful to consider our texts in terms of their origin within a broader context: that a relatively small proportion of the Judahite/Judean population and of the diaspora community used and produced literature. This is sometimes called the ‘literate élite’,<sup>464</sup> and conforms broadly to what Egyptologists and Assyriologists would call the ‘scribal class’, and those terms provide a useful shorthand—so long as it is clear that they do not denote a specific economic or professional class in the modern sense: members of the scribal class in Egypt and Mesopotamia could occupy many roles, from priests and senior civil-servants down to more humble amanuenses and foremen. My purpose in using this terminology ‘scribe’<sup>465</sup> is not to describe the nature and parameters of the class historically, but to emphasise the common ground between its members, and to suggest that textual interconnections offer us insights into commonalities that give a broad coherence to scribal culture, whatever the different interests or beliefs of individual scribes or of particular groups. In addition, this discourse about a ‘scribal

---

<sup>464</sup> In this thesis, when talking about a scribe, I will use expressions such as a scribal “élite” or a literate “expert”. Also, in some cases, I use “a scribal class”, but I do not use this phrase in the sense that it is used in the model of social and political stratification indicated in modern sociological theory. Jewish scribes, as I suppose, may mean literate élite and in a broad sense, the leading literati. Ehud Ben Zvi, “Prophetic Memories in the Deuteronomistic Historical and the Prophetic Collections of Books,” in *Israelite Prophecy and the Deuteronomistic History: Portrait, Reality, and the Formation of a History*, ed. Mignon R. Jacobs and Raymond F. Person, SBL ancient Israel and its literature 14 (Atlanta: SBL, 2013), 75, also uses this term “literati”.

<sup>465</sup> There is significant and general overlap between two words, Israelite/Judean and Jew. In this study, when dealing with scribal culture during the late Second Temple period, I call scribes ‘Jewish’ scribes rather than ‘Israelite’ or ‘Judean’ scribes.

class’ needs to be distinguished from conversations about ‘scribes’ who appear as individuals or groups in the Old Testament itself: it is a scholarly classification which does not necessarily correspond to the ways in which ancient writers would primarily have defined themselves, and certainly does not correspond to particular jobs or job-descriptions. The issue has also been complicated significantly by the scholarly association of wisdom literature in particular with ‘scribes’, but if we avoid the term ‘scribe’, that potentially leaves us without any term to describe the literati responsible for writing other types of literature.

Here, the working hypothesis in this chapter is that a ‘scribal class’, broadly conceived, was primarily responsible for the composition of biblical documents, and that scribal culture played an important role in preserving and disseminating them in the Second Temple period. Now I will present such claims in terms of the scribal culture of the Hebrew Bible, with critical evaluation of those arguments, and then will state the significance of scribal culture in biblical literature. My key questions are: ‘Is there a literate group of scribes and, if so, are they involved with the formation of biblical literature?’; ‘Can we confirm a scribal culture in making the Hebrew Bible?’; ‘Why have we focused on separate professional circles and why should we consider scribal culture?’

#### *4.1 Scribes as the Literati*

##### *4.1.1 The Extent of Literacy*

Before discussing this scribal class in ancient Israel, it is necessary to say something about the extent of literacy to avoid confusion. The dominant view amongst scholars today is that literacy was confined to a small proportion of the population, at least until the Greco-Roman period and possibly beyond.<sup>466</sup> Principally on the basis of internal evidence from the Bible, a few have

---

<sup>466</sup> See e.g. David M. Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2005), 172–3; van der Toorn, *Scribal*, 81–2; Christopher A. Rollston, *Writing and*

argued that literacy in ancient Israel was not limited to the minority, but was prevalent at all levels of Israel society which would make Israel highly unusual in the ancient context.<sup>467</sup> Aaron Demsky argues that while literacy and education to some degree were limited to professional groups, ‘within the framework of the family or the occupational unit, the child did learn the fundamentals of writings’.<sup>468</sup> From biblical and some epigraphic evidence, he argues that ‘during the last two hundred years of the monarchy’, ‘ancient Israel can be termed a literate society’ ‘where literacy was not limited to a closed group of professional scribes’.<sup>469</sup> The interpretation of biblical sources involved in such claims, however, has been challenged as inconclusive and questionable.<sup>470</sup> For instance, amongst the examples of supposedly widespread literacy, two cases are frequently mentioned; in Judg 8:14, a captured ‘young man’ (נער) from Succoth ‘wrote down for him a list of officials and elders’ ‘seventy-seven men’; and in Isa 10:19, the prophet declares that ‘the rest of the trees of his forest will be few, and then a boy will write them down’.<sup>471</sup> It would be hard, however, to generalise from these two cases to a nationwide level of education for children, even if we accept that this is not simply a case of

---

*Literacy in the World of Ancient Israel: Epigraphic Evidence from the Iron Age*, ABS 11 (Atlanta: SBL, 2010), 88–90.

<sup>467</sup> See Alan R. Millard, “An Assessment of the Evidence for Writing in Ancient Israel,” in *Biblical Archaeology Today: Proceedings of the International Congress on Biblical Archaeology Jerusalem, April 1984*, ed. Janet Amitai (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1985), 301–12; “Literacy: Ancient Israel,” in *ABD*, ed. David Noel Freedman, vol. 4 (NY: Doubleday, 1992), 337–40; Aaron Demsky, “On the Extent of Literacy in Ancient Israel,” in *Biblical Archaeology Today: Proceedings of the International Congress on Biblical Archaeology Jerusalem, April 1984*, ed. Janet Amitai (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1985), 349–53; “Writing in Ancient Israel and Early Judaism: Part One: The Biblical Period,” in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading & Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism & Early Christianity* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2004), 2–20.

<sup>468</sup> Demsky, “On the Extent,” 350.

<sup>469</sup> *Ibid.*, 351.

<sup>470</sup> Menahem Haran, “On the Diffusion of Literacy and Schools in Ancient Israel,” *VTSup* 40 (1988): 81–95; Ian Young, “Israelite Literacy: Interpreting the Evidence: Part1,” *VT* 48, no. 2 (1998): 239–53; “Israelite Literacy: Interpreting the Evidence: Part2,” *VT* 48, no. 3 (1998): 408–22; Edward Lipiński, “Royal and State Scribes in Ancient Jerusalem,” in *Congress Volume* (Leiden: Brill, 1988), 157–64.

<sup>471</sup> See Robert McCormick Adams and Carl H. Kraeling, eds., *City Invincible: A Symposium on Urbanization and Cultural Development in the Ancient Near East* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1960), 119, 123.

writers projecting their own literacy onto others.<sup>472</sup> Moreover, what both ‘a young man’ of Succoth and ‘a boy’ in Isaiah write would not require a proficient writing ability, but rather it is simply a long list of names (in Judges), and the total number or at most names of trees which is so few (in Isaiah). Consequently, these records do not mean that two young men were equipped with the sort of literacy involved in the composition or even the reading of literature. In the same way, the passage of Jer 32:12 (‘Jeremiah’s witnesses who signed the deed of purchase’) means no more than sealing their signatures.<sup>473</sup> Such as, discussions of literacy require an appreciation that people are literate at different levels and in different ways.<sup>474</sup> This level of literacy in ancient Israel and Judah, as elsewhere, was probably restricted to a limited group or class of educated individuals, while the culture of the substantial majority remained essentially oral.<sup>475</sup>

#### 4.1.2 Scribes in Ancient Near East and Israel

In general, the majority of members of other ancient Near Eastern societies were similarly illiterate and existed in an oral world, and most Egyptologists and Assyriologists agree that in ancient times literacy was limited, although they might have a different view as to how much it was restricted.<sup>476</sup> In ancient Babylon and Egypt, scribes came to constitute a social class, with

---

<sup>472</sup> Young, “Israelite Literacy 1,” 239 asks; “just because one “young lad” was able to write, does that mean that every “young lad” was similarly able?”

<sup>473</sup> Haran, “Diffusion,” 84.

<sup>474</sup> Rollston notes that “the capacity to scrawl one’s name on a contract, but without the ability to write or read anything else is not literacy, not even some sort of ‘functional literacy’” and that “those with this level of aptitude should be classed as illiterate”. See Rollston, *Writing*, 127. This, perhaps, goes too far in the other direction, by excluding a measure of literacy widely used in other historical disciplines.

<sup>475</sup> Stuart Weeks, “Literacy, Orality, and Literature in Israel,” in *On Stone and Scroll: Essays in Honour of Graham Ivor Davies*, ed. James K. Aitken, Katharine J. Dell, and Brian A. Mastin, BZAW Bd. 420 (Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 2011), 465–78.

<sup>476</sup> For literacy in cuneiform texts, see A. Leo Oppenheim, “The Position of the Intellectual in Mesopotamian Society,” *Daedalus* 104, no. 2 (1975): 37–46; Dominique Charpin, *Reading and Writing in Babylon*, trans. Jane Marie Todd (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2010); Giuseppe Visicato, *The Power and the Writing: The Early Scribes of Mesopotamia* (Bethesda, MD: CDL, 2000). For Egyptian literacy, see John Baines, “Literacy and Ancient Egyptian Society,” *Man* 18, no. 3 (1983): 572–99. For the Syro-Hittite scribes, see Yoram Cohen, *The Scribes and Scholars of the City of Emar in the Late Bronze Age*, HSS 59 (IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009). For literacy in ancient Israel, see Rollston, *Writing*;

literacy serving as a central social mark for the élite,<sup>477</sup> because it was not available to most Egyptians.<sup>478</sup> Reading and writing scrolls was the responsibility of this literate group, but their literacy was also a sign of social status,<sup>479</sup> even if women and even kings could belong to that élite without the ability to write and read.<sup>480</sup> Similarly, literacy in Mesopotamian culture was deeply rooted in a scribal élite, many of whom would have been involved in the production and distribution of texts; a Sumerian-Akkadian proverb says: ‘The scribal art, receiving a handsome fee, is a bright-eyed guardian, the need of the palace’.<sup>481</sup>

Now, the general consensus that ‘scribes’, a literate élite in both ancient Mesopotamia and Egypt, were in charge of ancient documents as actual producers, may be applied in the social context of ancient Israel, although this reasoning may not be generalised in all cases. It is a reasonable assumption that Israel and Judah inherited or evolved systems similar to those in other nearby cultures and that biblical literature was composed and transmitted by scribes understood in this sense.<sup>482</sup> On such an understanding, it is likely that the educated members of this class acquired their education at least in part through engagement with existing texts, which gave them a familiarity with such things as literary style, genre, and poetic techniques, and which explains the relative coherence and consistency of such things in the biblical corpus. To

---

Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*, STDJ 54 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2004), searches scribal activities in the Dead Sea Scroll.

<sup>477</sup> Laurie E. Pearce, “The Scribes and Scholars of Ancient Mesopotamia,” *CANE*, Vol 4 (NY: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1995); See Edward F. Wente, “The Scribes of Ancient Egypt,” *CANE*, Vol 4 (NY: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1995).

<sup>478</sup> Baines says that “several lines of reasoning suggest that in most periods no more than one per cent. of the population were literate.” Baines, “Literacy,” 584.

<sup>479</sup> John Baines, *Visual and Written Culture in Ancient Egypt* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2009), 43.

<sup>480</sup> *Ibid.*, 79.

<sup>481</sup> Pearce, “Scribes,” 2265.

<sup>482</sup> Lipiński, “Royal”; Philip R. Davies, *Scribes and Schools: The Canonization of the Hebrew Scriptures*, LAI (London: SPCK, 1998); Carr, *Tablet*; van der Toorn, *Scribal*; Weeks, “Literacy”. There has been some criticism of this idea. Van Seters objects to van der Toorn’s idea in terms of the role of scribes in the Second Temple period. See John Van Seters, “The Role of the Scribe in the Making of the Hebrew Bible,” *JANER* 8, no. 1 (2008): 99–129; also see William M. Schniedewind, “In Conversation with W. M. Schniedewind, How the Bible Became a Book: The Textualization of Ancient Israel (Cambridge, 2003),” ed. David M. Carr et al., *JHS* 5 (2005): 44–56.



what extent this engagement took place within the formal structures of a school system is unclear,<sup>483</sup> but that issue need not detain us here. It is perhaps more important to observe that the result, at least in other countries, was a level of coherence in the literary culture, but not simply uniformity, so that to speak of such an educated class is not to exclude the possibility that its members may have had various opinions and interests. It is not my concern here to exclude the possibility even of distinct groups and circles within the scribal class, but rather to emphasise that, whatever diversity there may have been, there would also have been a shared literary and cultural heritage. Given that concern, it is not my intention to attempt a detailed analysis of the scribal class, and it is doubtful that the evidence exists even to make such an attempt. I shall attempt to clarify and explain a few related issues in terms of the identity of the scribes which this project deals with, however, in the rest of this chapter.

#### 4.1.3 The Identity of Scribes

##### 4.1.3.1 *The Continuity of Scribal Culture*

Before looking at critical reflections on the idea of scribes, there is an issue that needs to be clarified. As discussed in Chapter 1, if realising that the present forms of Job and Deutero-Isaiah have been produced in a similar cultural milieu during the long span of the exilic and post-exilic periods, one may find that the linguistic dating would not readily prove the direction of literary references. And, the idea of scribal culture which I am dealing with perhaps would not create the same problem, because the origin of the two books can be substantially explained

---

<sup>483</sup> Interpreters insisted upon the existence of a formal educational system in Israel which could be a form of a school, and this left many controversial issues. On the one hand, some suppose that there was a type of school as a standardized institute in ancient Israel. See David W. Jamieson-Drake, *Scribes and Schools in Monarchic Judah: A Socio-Archeological Approach*, JSOTSup 109 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1991); André Lemaire, *Les Écoles et La Formation de La Bible Dans L'ancien Israël*, Orbis biblicus et orientalis 39 (Fribourg, Suisse: Editions universitaires; Göttingen, 1981); Rollston, *Writing*, 91–113. On the other hand, others do not see affirmative evidence of the existence of schools. See Friedemann W. Golka, “The Israelite School or ‘The Emperor’s New Cloths,’” in *The Leopard’s Spots: Biblical and African Wisdom in Proverbs* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993), 4–15; Stuart Weeks, *Early Israelite Wisdom*, OTMs (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999).

by the cultural environment of a scribal class appearing in continuous periods from the exilic to the post-exilic period, not in a discrete time. Accordingly, the Persian period, as I suppose, would be a reasonable era, encompassing the extent of the scribal culture related to our discussion; scholars have, in fact, considered that Judahite culture after the Babylonian conquest and during the subsequent rule of the Persian Empire (539-332 BCE) underwent a great change and that the Judahite culture after Exile seemed to have evolved into a new phase of Jewish culture.<sup>484</sup> However, the scribal culture is not intended to be placed into a stage evolutionized and advanced from the primeval to the civilized, but one needs to consider the scribal culture which had not dramatically changed between the Babylonian and Persian reigns.

#### 4.1.3.2 *Critical Reflections*

The next significant question to be considered is the social identity of scribes in the Persian period. For this, most scholars have supposed that the production of religious writings in ancient Israel was likely to be controlled by the powerful circle of the state. In fact, it has been common ground among such scholars as William Schniedewind, David Carr, Karel van der Toorn, and Philip Davies, that scribes as biblical writers were closely related to the central administration. What they commonly argue is that, as in other ancient Near Eastern cultures, a professional group of scribes employed by Judah's government wrote, read, and preserved religious documents on behalf of the royal family or temple officials.

On the one hand, some argue that biblical texts were written by royal scribes. Edward Lipiński claims that scribes in Israel and Judah were restricted to the 'royal and state scribes' as bureaucrats, although non-professional and ordinary scribes existed.<sup>485</sup> Schniedewind maintains that the biblical materials were exclusively preserved and extended by the Judean royal family

---

<sup>484</sup> John M. Efron, *The Jews: A History* (Upper Saddle River, NJ; London: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2009), 26–9.

<sup>485</sup> Lipiński, "Royal"; Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972), 158–71.

during the Babylonian exile, and after the return to Jerusalem by temple priests and scribes.<sup>486</sup> On the other hand, some suppose that the scribal activities which produced the Hebrew Bible occurred in the temple of Jerusalem. Van der Toorn doubts that royal scribes were involved with professional writings and that royal scribes which some (Lipiński, Weinfeld, and Schniedewind) noticed, were, in fact, merely court secretaries. According to van der Toorn, scribes who wrote most of biblical literature were temple scribes, maybe Levitical scribes attached to Jerusalem, because the Jerusalem temple in ancient Israel was regarded as ‘an annex of the royal palace’;<sup>487</sup> as the centre of education, worship, and written law. Other scholars do not strictly distinguish temple scribes from palace scribes, but they describe scribes as being related to occupations of governmental institutes. Davies mainly designates the scribal class as ‘servants of ruler or temple’ and as public officials ‘sustained from the revenues of palace or temple’.<sup>488</sup> Based on this definition, Davies regards the roles of scribes as professionals as explaining the composition of biblical materials in the Second Temple period; although Davies recognises the existence of the private scribes.<sup>489</sup> Carr, in the same way, notices that although all the writers were not necessarily restricted to literate officials and scribes, biblical and non-biblical evidence present ‘the foregoing picture of limited literacy’ and ‘clear signs of having been produced by professionals, literate specialists’.<sup>490</sup> In Carr’s model, Judean scribes until the exilic and the later Persian period were confined to the members of ruling classes.<sup>491</sup> Schams’ detailed analysis of the possible model of Jewish scribes in the Second Temple period is not different from Carr and others. She argues that scribes in the Persian period functioned as high officials and intellectuals and occupied administrative

---

<sup>486</sup> William M. Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book: The Textualization of Ancient Israel* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004), 139–94.

<sup>487</sup> van der Toorn, *Scribal*, 85.

<sup>488</sup> Davies, *Scribes and Schools*, 17.

<sup>489</sup> *Ibid.*, 36.

<sup>490</sup> Carr, *Tablet*, 118, 122.

<sup>491</sup> He argues that “though it is probable that some of Jehoiachin’s retinue were masters of the tradition and we now have inscriptional evidence that scribes were active elsewhere in the Jewish Diaspora, it is unclear how such groups would have access to written versions of the tradition”. *Ibid.*, 168.

positions and ‘outside the Temple and the Achaemenid administration few or no independent scribes could be found’.<sup>492</sup> According to her, evidence of village/town scribes outside Jerusalem and of the growing number of independent scribes is found only at the end of the Hellenistic period.<sup>493</sup>

#### 4.1.3.3 *Identity and Definition of Scribes*

In this sphere, most scholars tend to use the meaning of the ‘scribe’ in a narrow definition and are inclined to visualise a circle of vocational scribes working for the bureaucratic centres in Jerusalem. Of course, this social position of scribes could be acceptable in a general sense, and the notion of royal or temple scribes engaging with the upper class could be easily imagined in the period of monarchy before Exile. Christopher Rollston, for instance, notices from Old Hebrew epigraphic evidence:

*Israelite scribes were the recipients of formal, standardized education. Furthermore, in the terms of aegis, I believe that the mechanism most responsible for the standardized education of professional scribes was the state.*<sup>494</sup>

Not only in the pre-exilic period, but also in the Second Temple period, there would be scribes working in the national apparatus. Until the Hellenistic and Roman periods, a major increase of literacy and the popularity of literate education in Israel would not occur,<sup>495</sup> and we may see in the end of the Second Temple period a high percentage of village/town scribes and independent private scribes alongside all the levels of official scribes.

Nevertheless, it is questionable whether scribal activities in the Persian period should essentially appear in professions attached to Judean governmental institutions such as temples,

---

<sup>492</sup> Christine Schams, *Jewish Scribes in the Second-Temple Period*, JSOTSup 291 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998), 311.

<sup>493</sup> *Ibid.*, 320–1.

<sup>494</sup> Rollston, *Writing*, 113.

<sup>495</sup> Carr, *Tablet*, 173.

palaces, schools, and libraries. If, as many presume, the definition of ‘scribe’ has to be applied exclusively to the literate élite within administrative or religious centres, what do we call those who were highly literate and had the same intellectual background of scribal training from the temple, but who did not serve in the temple? The idea that scribes belonged solely to either the royal or temple service needs to be qualified by the observation that, whatever their national loyalties, not all ancient scribes were employed directly in this way. The evidence from Mesopotamia is constrained by the fact that most of our texts come from royal or temple archives, but from as early as the Middle Kingdom in Egypt we find the involvement of scribes in purely commercial transactions. This makes sense, of course, in contexts where to become a scribe was a hereditary calling, since it cannot be presumed that the number of official posts would increase in line with the inevitable growth in the number of scribes.

Let us see more evidence available relating to Egyptian and Mesopotamian scribes, in order to confirm that Jewish scribes are not restricted to a formal occupation attached to the palace and/or the temple. Of course, in ancient Mesopotamia there are temple/palace scribes who function in bureaucratic and governmental positions. While ‘palace scribes’ work with archives, writing and preserving records which are associated with the affairs of kings and royal families and with matters of court and administration, ‘temple scribes’ function as high officials and helped to manage temple archives.<sup>496</sup> However, there were individual scribes employed by small-sized personal enterprises; for instance, Laurie Pearce notes that in ancient Mesopotamia ‘distribution of scribes across various specialties is estimated as follows: 70 percent administrative; 20 percent private; and 10 percent scientific and quasi-scientific activities.’<sup>497</sup> Whatever their professions and job descriptions are, their social status could be regarded as scribes.

---

<sup>496</sup> Pearce, “Scribes,” 2273–4.

<sup>497</sup> Ibid., 2273.

In ancient Egypt, what makes the issue complicated is the fact that most evidence about scribes comes from the self-presentation of dignitaries who speak mainly of their public and professional identity. However, although there are various titles or roles of individuals shown in the Egyptian texts, they do not illustrate what precisely are their professions. There is evidence in the New Kingdom that would prove that ‘scribe’ stands for a social identity for élite members, but there is no strong evidence for limiting literacy to temple-trained scribes before some time in the first millennium BCE.<sup>498</sup> Although Egyptian scribes served in administrative roles, doing kings’ business as preservers and writers of a complex form of script, they could participate in the enterprises of any individuals. Of course, from the introduction of demotic literacy, Egyptian scribes seem to have become much more professionalized, but in the creation of texts in Egypt there is little evidence to posit an exclusive relationship with the temple/palace sphere until the later periods. In recent research, Chloé Ragazzoli, interestingly notices in the New Kingdom where writers of graffiti ‘chose to present themselves as scribes as the sign of a certain status, not of a function’.<sup>499</sup> Thus, there is little reason to suppose that in Egypt and Mesopotamia, ‘scribe’ had been understood only as a vocational title related to state.

Moreover, Jewish literate groups who could have produced biblical materials lived in circumstances quite different from Mesopotamian and Egyptian literates. After the destruction of Judah, a crucial change to the Judean community was the relocation of the literate élite into many different locations and afterwards, they remained a coherent community in foreign countries; there would be continuing communities of people in important social positions who were not working for the Judahite or the Persian government. This means that centres of the Judean élite in the Persian period could exist outside the territory of Judah. When educated

---

<sup>498</sup> From the document in “the Ramesside village of Deir el Medina”, he maintains that “‘scribes’ was used as a courtesy title for all literate members of the community.” See Christopher Eyre, *The Use of Documents in Pharaonic Egypt* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2013), 233.

<sup>499</sup> Chloé C. D. Ragazzoli, “The Social Creation of a Scribal Place: The Visitors’ Inscriptions in the Tomb Attributed to Antefiqer (TT 60),” in *SAK Band 42* (H. Buske Verlag, 2014), 51.

scribes were deported to Babylon, all the evidence of cultural continuity within that community—and subsequently also in Alexandria—suggests that they continued to act and to educate their sons as members of the scribal class, although few of them are likely to have served in official positions at foreign courts. In particular, recent archaeological discoveries have confirmed that the Babylonian and Egyptian Jewish communities successfully became members of foreign countries and they produced a number of documents; Jewish documents in the diaspora community have been found in various places since the Neo-Babylonian epoch. I here give evidence to suggest that Jewish scribal activity in the Second Temple period may be a widespread phenomenon, not limited to a single geographical location.

The first proposed evidence comes from texts recording the financial dealings of a Jewish family who lived in Babylonian Nippur in the fifth century BCE. The discovery of the so-called Murashu archive (650 cuneiform tablets) from Nippur ranging in date from 454 to 404 BCE informed us of the life of the Babylonian Diaspora in this period. The Murashu texts show that significant numbers of deportees settled and remained as Judeans in Babylon after the Exile, and they describe many individuals bearing Yahwistic names.<sup>500</sup> The corpus, in particular, presents a large amount of documents—such as contracts, loans, transactions, etc—which ‘loaned money, held mortgages, leased and subleased land, collected taxes and rents, and was engaged in other operations related to the management of land property, the mainstay of the

---

<sup>500</sup> In the Murashu archive, many Jews at Nippur had no Yahwistic names, but instead Babylonian and Aramaic names. However, it is not necessary for them to take the form of an Yahwistic name. We have much evidence that these Judeans in the region were deeply integrated in Babylonian society. See Michael David Coogan, “Life in the Diaspora: Jews at Nippur in the Fifth Century B.C.,” *BA* 37, no. 1 (1974): 6–12; Lester L. Grabbe, *A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period*, LSTS 47 (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 316–8; Pearce suggests new evidence for Judean deportees in Babylon. See Laurie E. Pearce, “New Evidence for Judeans in Babylonia,” in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 399–411; “‘Judean’: A Special Status in Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid Babylonia?,” in *Judah and the Judeans in the Achaemenid Period* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011), 267–77.

Babylonian economy'.<sup>501</sup> This Jewish community in Babylon indicates the possibility of the presence of scribes which continued their identity as a highly intellectual group.

Secondly, there was a particular group of mercenaries—maybe with their families—settled in a Jewish military colony in Egypt.<sup>502</sup> This community possessed a considerable number of written works during the reign of the Persian Empire; these works have been known as the Elephantine papyri, which are mostly written in Aramaic.<sup>503</sup> It has been argued that there would be religious and spiritual life by a confessional Jewish community around the Elephantine Temple, although we have no definite clue to the date of the building their Temple to God.<sup>504</sup> This archive (dated from 495 to 399 BCE) includes a massive number of documents relating to the ownership of property and the temple of Yahweh, preserved in the form of letters, contracts, and historical/literary works.<sup>505</sup> Bezalel Porten notices that the legal documents by Jewish scribes 'testify to diverse social and economic activity on the one hand and to a developed scribal craft on the other' and that individual scribes developed their personal characteristics in writings.<sup>506</sup> The Jewish scribal texts in Elephantine indicate that scribal activity was prevalent in the Egyptian diaspora; some Jews in the military colony were literate and could transmit at least one literary text, *Sayings of Ahiqar*, which is the earliest copy of it.

---

<sup>501</sup> Elias J. Bickerman, "The Babylonian Captivity," in *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, ed. W. D. Davies and Louis Finkelstein, vol. 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984), 345.

<sup>502</sup> James D. Purvis, "Exile and Return: From the Babylonian Destruction to the Reconstruction of the Jewish State," in *Ancient Israel* (Washington, DC: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1988), 164; Lester L. Grabbe, *Introduction to Second Temple Judaism: History and Religion of the Jews in the Time of Nehemiah, the Maccabees, Hillel, and Jesus* (US: T&T Clark, 2010), 4–5.

<sup>503</sup> See Bezalel Porten, *Archives from Elephantine: The Life of an Ancient Jewish Military Colony* (Berkeley: University of California, 1968).

<sup>504</sup> Edda Bresciani, "Egypt, Persian Satrapy," in *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, ed. W. D. Davies and Louis Finkelstein, vol. 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984), 368.

<sup>505</sup> See Grabbe, *Judaism*, 318–9; Bresciani, "Egypt, Persian Satrapy," 1:366–8; Purvis, "Exile and Return," 164–5.

<sup>506</sup> See Bezalel Porten, "The Jews in Egypt," in *The Cambridge History of Judaism* (ed. W. D. Davies and Louis Finkelstein; vol. 1; Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984), 393–400; "Settlement of the Jews at Elephantine and the Arameans at Syene," in *Judah and the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period* (ed. Oded Lipschits and Joseph Blenkinsopp; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2003), 451–70.



What is more, evidence that Jewish ‘scribalism’ was assigned not only to the Jews residing in Yehud province, but also to all the diaspora communities, is found in the Hellenistic and Roman periods. We have known that there was a Hellenistic diaspora in Alexandria, Egypt which wrote the Septuagint, the Greek version of the Hebrew Bible—dated to the third century BCE, and from the legend in the *Letter of Aristeas* which refers to King Ptolemy II Philadelphus (283-246 BCE).<sup>507</sup> This would mean that those literate people who wrote and translated them did not work in the Jerusalem temple. Scribal activities which are observed in the texts in the Judean desert (‘the Dead Sea Scrolls’) also confirm that biblical materials are probably not limited to the temple.<sup>508</sup> Moreover, we see different literate groups in Galilee and in Babylon which created two literary traditions of the Talmud which are significant texts of Rabbinic Judaism left in the Amoraic period (200-500 CE). Interestingly, both Amoraic schools produced two independent versions of the Talmud using the first written Torah Mishnah; Babylonian Talmud (‘Bavli’) and Jerusalem Talmud (‘Yerushalmi’); it is difficult of course to determine which version is more original and primitive in the Talmudic tradition.<sup>509</sup> From these different Talmudic versions, what we may confirm is that independent literary traditions would exist in foreign countries, outside the Jerusalem temple.

The descriptions and titles of the scribes may be varied in the texts, and the Judean scribes substantially worked in the royal office and the temple, but it is unnecessary to make a division between the royal administration and the temple, in that the temple was also owned by a king. Scribes are unlikely to correspond to any single job, but perhaps are depicted as continuing

---

<sup>507</sup> There are debates of the date of Septuagint, but it is certain that LXX confirms Alexandrian Jewish diaspora who could read and interpret the Hebrew sacred texts. See Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Understanding Second Temple and Rabbinic Judaism* (Jersey City, NJ: Ktav, 2003), 127–30. Clancy claims that none of LXX occurred before 150 BCE. See Frank Clancy, “The Date of LXX,” *SJOT* 16, no. 2 (2002): 207–25.

<sup>508</sup> Tov, *Scribal*, 7–30.

<sup>509</sup> In its comparison, the sugyot of Bavli are “more long-winded and discursive” than the sugyot of Yerushalmi, so that it might be reasonable to say that “the Yerushalmi was redacted at least one hundred years before the Bavli”. However, there are many differences between them. See Louis Isaac Rabinowitz and Stephen G. Wald, “Talmud, Jerusalem,” *EJ*, 2007, 484.

their social position while having different professions. To that extent, the vocabularies and descriptions of the scribes in the Hebrew Bible—which we will see in the next section—are comparable with those of the scribes that we use in Egypt and Mesopotamia, and the identity of the scribes in Judah may correspond approximately to the general category of a scribal class in Egypt and Mesopotamia.

We, therefore, need to avoid viewing scribalism in the framework of professionalism and to understand that סֹפֵר represents a high level of education and enculturation. The extent of סֹפֵר possibly could be extended to a whole circle of learned literati who were competent in their skills, but who did not use them either to earn a living or to be employed. In this research, when I speak of the ‘scribe’ as a biblical author, it refers to all the skilful literate who could read and write texts, whether they were educated in the temple, at school, or in the home and whether later on they had jobs in public institutions, private business, or were unemployed. All the biblical writings could be composed and conducted by these scribes, the literati. Accordingly, I understand the term סֹפֵר as the ‘literate person’, who regarded themselves as members of a class, including but not confined to vocational specialists who were in temple/royal service.

#### 4.2 *Scribes as Biblical Writers*

Researchers such as Carr, van der Toorn, Rollston, and Schniedewind at present who study the process of the literary growth of the Hebrew Bible have maintained with internal, external, and comparative evidences that scribes contributed to the present form of biblical literature, whether or not the pre-stage of the present form partly existed in oral or written forms; although there are differences in identifying the role and position of scribes. However, unfortunately, even adherents of the theory about the existence of literate élites have recognised the scarcity of textual evidence from the Hebrew Bible.<sup>510</sup> It is true that examples to signify that authors of the biblical literature were scribes are rare. This insufficient proof might prevent us from agreeing

---

<sup>510</sup> van der Toorn, *Scribal*, 75.

with the supposition that scribes were biblical writers. But in spite of this difficulty, there are significant biblical vestiges in terms of scribal activities; it would also be difficult to prove that Egyptian and Babylonian texts were written by scribes, if we did not have early copies with the names of the copyists on them.

#### 4.2.1 סֵפֶר in the Hebrew Bible

Let us first start looking at how the Hebrew Bible uses the term סֵפֶר translated to ‘scribe’. In *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, the term סֵפֶר (סֵפֶרִים) (in a form of qal, participle) means ‘one who counts’ and is rendered in five different ways: (1) ‘scribe, scholar’, ‘as copying the Law’, ‘or writing documents’; (2) ‘military officer, commander of army’; (3) ‘(civil) officer, official, administrator’; (4) ‘tribute or tax collector’; (5) ‘one who is counting days of impurity’.<sup>511</sup> *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* suggests four meanings: (1) ‘scribe’, ‘secretary’; (2) ‘state scribe’, ‘secretary’; (3) ‘secretary for Jewish affairs’; (4) ‘conversant with the scriptures’.<sup>512</sup> With these references, the meaning of סֵפֶר can be divided by four cases. Firstly, סֵפֶר in a broad sense means a ‘writer’, or a ‘copyist’; the man with a ‘writing case’ (קִסְתַּת הַסֵּפֶר; Ezek 9:2, 3, 11); ‘the pen of scribes’ (עֵט סֵפֶרִים; Jer 8:8); ‘iron pen and lead’ (עֵט־בְּרֹזֶל וְעֵפֶרֶת; Job 19:24; cf. Jer 17:1); a ‘scribe’s knife’ (תֵּעַר הַסֵּפֶר; Jer 36:23).<sup>513</sup> Secondly, the connotation which is the closest to the root verb סָפַר is ‘tax collector’ in Isa 33:18; ‘where is the tax collector?’; ‘where is the one who counts?’

Thirdly, the term סֵפֶר in many biblical narratives is linked to the role of high state official including civil servants and priests. Historical narratives in the Israelite monarchy include some lists of these royal and temple administrators. These scribes as a profession have emerged in ‘family-like guilds’ in the Israel monarchy (2 Sam 8:17; 20:25; 1 Kgs 4:3; 1 Chr 18:16) and in

---

<sup>511</sup> David J. A. Clines, ed., “DCH” (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993), VI:185–6.

<sup>512</sup> HALOT, 2:767.

<sup>513</sup> James Philip Hyatt, “The Writing of an Old Testament Book,” *BA* 6, no. 4 (1943): 78–9.

the Judean monarchy (2 Kgs 22:3, 12, 14; 25:22; Jer 26:24; 36:11, 12).<sup>514</sup> On the one hand, they occupied a rank of a governmental official in the palace. For instance, Seraiah as a scribe is included in the list of David's high officials and סֵפֶר may refer to 'royal secretary' (2 Sam 8:17; 20:25).<sup>515</sup> In 1 Kgs 4:3, Elihoreph and Ahijah in Solomon's cabinets are described as 'secretaries', and סֵפֶר is tied up with recording the activity (הַמְזִכִּיר) of Jehoshaphat (cf. 2 Sam 20:24). In the same way, in 2 Kgs 18:18, 37, Shebna סֵפֶר is accompanied with the royal administrator Eliakim who is in charge of the palace and the recorder Joah, and in 2 Kgs 19:2 is dispatched to the prophet Isaiah. On the other hand, the activity of scribes is more likely to be associated with the priesthood in the temple. For instance, Shemaiah, the son of Nethanel, a Levite, as סֵפֶר is involved in making records (1 Chr 24:6), and some Levites were scribes (2 Chr 34:13). Finally, this term appears in the meaning involved with military officers and commanders. In 2 Kgs 25:19 and Jer 52:25, סֵפֶר which is the proper title of 'the commander-in-chief' (שָׂר הַצְבָּא) can be interpreted as 'secretary' or 'officer' in the army.<sup>516</sup> סֵפֶר (in שֵׁבֶט סֵפֶר 'the staff of an officer') is parallel with מְחַקְקִים ('commanders') in Judg 5:14. Whether סֵפֶר contains the sense of commander or simply a writer in these verses, this term seems to hold a position in the military context.

Fourthly, סֵפֶר is used in the sense of a 'scholar' producing and writing the Law and all sorts of documents (Ezra 7:6, 11; Neh 8:1, 4, 9, 13; 12:26, 36). The book of Jeremiah introduces Baruch as a copyist and writer of Jeremiah's prophecy (Jer 36; 43:2-3), and describes scribes as wise men who have the Law of Yahweh (8:8). In Jer 36:10 (cf. vv. 12, 20-21), the expression 'the chamber (בֵּלְשַׁכַּת) of Gemariah the son of Shaphan the scribe' denotes the possibility that there would be a group of scribes in the temple forming the advisory group of the king and Baruch as

---

<sup>514</sup> Aaron Demsky, "Scribe," ed. Fred Skolnik and Michael Berenbaum, *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA in association with Keter Publishing House, 2007), 212.

<sup>515</sup> A. A. Anderson, *2 Samuel*, WBC 11 (Dallas, Tex: WBC, 1989), 137.

<sup>516</sup> T. R. Hobbs, *2 Kings*, WBC 13 (Waco, Tex: Word Books, 1985), 365; DCH, VI:185.

a temple scribe might go through the scribal training (Jer 36:18, 26, 32).<sup>517</sup> Another word טפסר, which is seen as a loan-word from Akkadian *tupšarru* ('tablet-writer') and which only appears in Jer 51:27 and Nah 3:17, can commonly be translated as a 'scribe'; in Nah 3:17, it may mean an 'administrative official' and in Jer 51:27, a 'conscription official' in the military background.<sup>518</sup>

#### 4.2.2 Scribe in the Second Temple Period

The definition of סֹפֵר in the connection with making biblical literature appears more frequently in the Second Temple period. Of course, we lack records of the history and life of Jews in this period to understand the social position of scribes. It is not easy to affirm how the meaning of סֹפֵר in the Hebrew Bible was semantically changed after the exilic period. However, it was probably not until the Persian period that סֹפֵר tends to be more presented as literary experts or scholars who learned the Torah and other biblical texts.<sup>519</sup> Clues about the status and function of scribes in the Persian period are drawn from passages in Ezra and Nehemiah;<sup>520</sup> although there remain controversial issues as to the authorship, the historicity, and the composition of those books.<sup>521</sup>

Ezra's title in Ezra-Nehemiah has been used to explain the scribe as a scholar of the Torah. The title of Ezra in the Artaxerxes' letter (Ezra 7:12-26) written in Aramaic is given as כהנא סֹפֵר

---

<sup>517</sup> Holladay, *Jeremiah* 2, 257.

<sup>518</sup> H. Niehr, "סֹפֵר," *TDOT:X* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980); Tryggve N. D. Mettinger, *Solomonic State Officials: A Study of the Civil Government Officials of the Israelite Monarchy* (Gleerup, 1971), 51.

<sup>519</sup> TLOT vol.2, 809; TDOT vol.2, 324.

<sup>520</sup> Schams, *Jewish*, 44–71; Rollston, *Writing*, 89–90.

<sup>521</sup> To some degree, there seems to be a scholarly consensus that the composition of Ezra-Nehemiah went through several redactional stages with literary sources such as "Ezra Memoir", "Nehemiah Memoir", and "Ezra 1-6". See H. G. M. Williamson, *Ezra, Nehemiah*, WBC 16 (Waco Texas: Word Books, 1985), xxiii–xxxv; Lester L. Grabbe, *Ezra-Nehemiah*, Old Testament Readings (London: Routledge, 1998), 93–109; Jacob M. Myers, *Ezra, Nehemiah*, AB 14 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1965), xxxviii–lii.

והוא סֵפֶר מהיר בתורת משה אשר־נתן יהוה אלהי ישראל ('the priest, the scribe of the law of the God of heaven') in vv. 12, 21. Other than this, part of the narrative (vv. 1-11) exhibits it as:

והוא סֵפֶר מהיר בתורת משה אשר־נתן יהוה אלהי ישראל  
*He was a scribe skilled in the Torah of Moses that Yahweh the God of Israel had given (v. 6)*

לעזרא הכהן הסֵפֶר סֵפֶר דברי מצות־יהוה וחקיו וחקיו על־ישראל  
*Ezra, the priest, the scribe, scribe, in matters of commandments of Yahweh and his laws for Israel (v. 11)*

Stylistic differences in the title between the narrative and the letter have been suggested; e.g. in narrative, the use of tetragrammaton, the awkward repetition of סֵפֶר in v. 11b, and some additions ('skilled in the Torah of Moses') to modify 'scribe' in v. 6. Though the sceptical view about the historical authenticity of this letter has been suggested,<sup>522</sup> this title סֵפֶר is widely understood in the context of the Achaemenid Empire as 'an official Persian title' derived from the view of Han Heinrich Schaeder;<sup>523</sup> following him, many could view Ezra's position as the 'minister/secretary of state for Jewish affairs'.<sup>524</sup>

With this supposition, scholars have suggested that the oddity of the title in the narrative was due to the reinterpretation of the title 'scribe' presented in Ezra 7:12, 21, and was 'influenced by the use of comparable words in the Ezra memoir itself'.<sup>525</sup> The specification of Ezra's title as a skilled expert and student of Torah in vv. 6, 10, and 11 may possibly reflect how the editor of Ezra considered his role in the Persian period. For this issue, Schams moderately argues that, irrespective of the authenticity of the commissioning letter, there is enough evidence to believe

---

<sup>522</sup> Lester L. Grabbe, "What Was Ezra's Mission?," in *Second Temple Studies: 2. Temple Community in the Persian Period*, ed. Tamara C. Eskenazi and Kent Harold Richards, JSOT 117 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1991), 294 mentions that he cannot see "any evidence of such a concept as a commissioner for Jewish affairs from anything we know about Persian administration". Also see Lester L. Grabbe, "The 'Persian Documents' in the Book of Ezra: Are They Authentic?," in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period* (IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 531–70.

<sup>523</sup> Hans Heinrich Schaeder, *Esra Der Schreiber*, Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 5 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1930), 39–51.

<sup>524</sup> Williamson, *Ezra, Nehemiah*, 100; Myers, *Ezra, Nehemiah*, 60–1 also supports this view.

<sup>525</sup> Williamson, *Ezra, Nehemiah*, 92, 98.

that Ezra historically ‘was an official scribe in the Achaemenid administration’.<sup>526</sup> She, however, concludes that Ezra’s official title in 7:6, 11 may have reflected the editor’s theological view in the Persian period, and that ‘the author may have wanted to trace back the authority of priestly scribes in matters of the law to the early restoration in order to legitimize their role in his contemporary society’.<sup>527</sup> Thus, if the interpretation about Ezra’s titles is acceptable, the figure of Ezra could be viewed both as a high governmental officer working under the Achaemenid Empire—although this still leaves uncertainty in discerning the official position of Ezra from the titles—and as a ‘scriptural scholar’,<sup>528</sup> which may reflect the editor’s view concerning the role of scribes in the Persian period (cf. Ezra 7:10; Ps 45:2).

Another record about Ezra’s role as סֵפֶר appears in the expression הַסֵּפֶר לְהַבִּיאַת אֶת־סֵפֶר תּוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה אֲשֶׁר־צִוָּה יְהוָה אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל (‘the scribe to bring the scroll of Torah of Moses that Yahweh had given to Israel’) in Neh 8:1, when the assembly in Jerusalem completed building the walls and then appealed to Ezra to read the law of Moses (v. 3). In v. 13, the figure of Ezra is described as the scholar of the Torah, teaching religious leaders such as the priests and the Levites and the people; הַסֵּפֶר וּלְהַשְׁכִּיל אֶל־דְּבָרֵי הַתּוֹרָה (‘the scribe to understand the words of the Torah’). The commitment of Ezra, as the scribe and priest (vv. 1-6, 9a) reading and studying ‘the scroll of the Torah of Moses’ to the assembly is more likely to reflect the reality of the scribe in the Second Temple period.<sup>529</sup> In particular, van der Toorn notices that from this record in which the Levites helped Ezra during the temple service (Neh 8:7-8), ‘the Levitical scribes were teachers of Torah’ (2 Chr 17:9).<sup>530</sup> In addition to these cases of the use of סֵפֶר in the

---

<sup>526</sup> Schams, *Jewish*, 54.

<sup>527</sup> “[I]t cannot be known what Ezra’s official position and his mission were. The texts are taken to reflect the author’s notion of priests and scribes at a later time instead of the realities in the early postexilic period. The author may have wanted to trace back the authority of priestly scribes in matters of the law to the early restoration period in order to legitimize their role in his contemporary society.’ Ibid., 56.

<sup>528</sup> Niehr, “325 “, סֵפֶר.

<sup>529</sup> Williamson, *Ezra, Nehemiah*, 287.

<sup>530</sup> van der Toorn, *Scribal*, 79–80.

Second Temple period, the author of Nehemiah identifies Zadok as a scribe for the purpose of the suitable distribution of the tithe (Neh 13:13). סֵפֶר then could refer to an accountant and a recorder, and the appointment of the scribe was likely performed as part of reforming the temple. Finally, the passage of Ezra 4:17 exhibits the scribe Shimshai which is possibly a letter-writer to King Artaxerxes.<sup>531</sup>

In the Hellenistic period, there is a noteworthy description of scribes from the Wisdom of Ben Sira (Ecclesiasticus), where the author describes and praises an ideal ‘scribe’ as a true wise man, in contrast to manual workers (Sir 38:24-39:11). According to Ben Sira, scribes throw themselves completely into studying the law, the wisdom, and the prophecy (Sir 38:34cd-39:3), preserving and surveying texts which have been handed down from their ancestors:

*How different the person who devotes himself to the study of the law of the Most High! He explores the wisdom of all the ancients and is occupied with the prophecies; He preserves the discourses of the famous, and goes to the heart of involved sayings; He seeks out the hidden meaning of proverbs, and is busied with the enigmas found in parables. ... He will pour forth his words of wisdom and in prayer give praise to the Lord. (38:34cd-39:3, 6cd)<sup>532</sup>*

It is quite important to see that scribes in the Hellenistic period could engage a variety of scriptural knowledge and literary skills as an expert and artisan (Sir 39:1, 4). Rollston notes that ‘according to Ben Sira, the life of the scribe is far superior to that of the populace’ and that ‘he himself was the head of a school located in Jerusalem (Sir 51:23)’.<sup>533</sup> One thing which I need to mention is that there is the interchange of two terms, ‘wise men’/‘sages’ and ‘scribes’, in Sir 38:24-39:11. By this, it could be argued that sages were equal to scribes in their social function and role (cf. Jer 8:8-9). In a broad sense, scribes might be regarded as clever men in the level of their intellectual capacity. However, scribes as scriptural scholars should not be equalled to

---

<sup>531</sup> Schams, *Jewish*, 59.

<sup>532</sup> I use the translation of Jeremy Corley, *Sirach*, NCoBC 21 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 2013), 107–8.

<sup>533</sup> Rollston, *Writing*, 90.



sages or wise men from the reference in Sir 38:24.<sup>534</sup> The change of the role of סֵפֶר in Jewish community was a drift in the later Second Temple period; in the Roman period, especially by the influence of the rabbinic movement, scribes were ‘either designated by others with different names or titles, or they themselves chose to adopt new titles.’<sup>535</sup>

#### 4.2.3 Interpretation of Biblical Evidence

So far, we have discussed a variety of biblical links concerning the term סֵפֶר from the early monarchic period to the Second Temple period. Though those references are too limited to affirm the existence of a literate élite as scriptural authors, the evidence I have presented to some extent may suggest that the term סֵפֶר is connected with the literate who can read and write texts, and especially with a special upper group in palace and temple. However, when considering the list—kings, priests, levites, prophets, commanders, and other high officials<sup>536</sup>—who are said to write and read biblical books, our working hypothesis of scribes as writers might remain unproven. However, in this respect, we should pay attention to how to interpret biblical records about literacy.

The authenticity of some biblical narratives in terms of ‘writing/reading’ has been questioned with the possibility of later redactions. Carr claims that although there is prevalent evidence for literate specialists from various professions in the history of Israel, ‘many narratives are almost certainly not historically reliable’.<sup>537</sup> Though we may reserve judgement about the authenticity

---

<sup>534</sup> van der Toorn, *Scribal*, 81–2 argues without any evidence that “the accomplished scribe” “is an expert and a scholar”, and a sage. However, Schams, *Jewish*, 106 notes that “although the text remains fuzzy with regard to scribes and wise men they should not be identified.”

<sup>535</sup> Schams, *Jewish*, 325.

<sup>536</sup> The composition of the Hebrew Bible, apart from that being understood as “the word of God”, has been attributed to “king”, “community leader”, “prophet”, “royal official”, “scribe”, and “priest”. e.g., Moses (Exod 17:14; 24:4; 34:28; Num 33:2; Deut 31:9, 22); Joshua (Josh 24:26); Samuel (1 Sam 10:25); David (Ps 3, 7, 18, 34, etc; probably originated by late additions); Solomon (Prov 1:1); Ezra (Ezra 7); Isaiah (8:1; 30:8); Jeremiah (Jer 30:2); Baruch (Jer 36:4); Ezekiel (Ezek 24:2); Daniel (Dan 7:1). See Young, “Israelite Literacy 1,” 245–7.

<sup>537</sup> Carr, *Tablet*, 119.

of a given text, it is required to comprehend what it means, when the text says that biblical figures like prophets and kings wrote and read.<sup>538</sup> Seen in the relationship between Jeremiah and Baruch in Jer 36, it should be noted that the prophet who was commanded to write (כתב) God's words was not a real writer, but he dictated to Baruch the scribe. From this instance, Carr maintains that 'examples like this—however fictional—of putative reading/writing versus "actual" reading/writing raise questions about other instances in which a king (e.g. David), other major figures (e.g. Jezebel in 1 Kgs 21:8-11), or a group of people (e.g. Neh 9:3) is described as writing or reading'.<sup>539</sup> That to write a text means to make scribes write, can be confirmed in Esther 8:8-9.<sup>540</sup> The King Ahasuerus commands Esther and Mordecai to write the king's edict and then the king's scribes are immediately summoned for writing. With regard to 'reading', there is a noteworthy example in 2 Kgs 22. Though Huldah the prophetess said that 'the king of Judah has read' 'all the words of the scroll' (2 Kgs 22:16), the person who read the book of Law (v. 10) was not the king Josiah, but Shaphan the scribe.<sup>541</sup> Shaphan is portrayed as reading it 'in the front of the king', so that 'reading (oneself)' is identified as equal to 'having something read to one'.<sup>542</sup> Thus, when someone in the Bible is portrayed as writing and reading a text, it does not necessarily imply that he/she directly wrote and read it or was a literate person.<sup>543</sup>

#### 4.2.4 Jeremiah, Baruch, and Scribe: Jeremiah 36

The most complete illustration to describe the writing process of biblical literature is found in Jeremiah 36 indicating how the oral statement becomes the written scroll. Jeremiah is

---

<sup>538</sup> Young, "Israelite Literacy 1," 248 provides useful analysis for biblical passages which speak of who read and write texts. He notices that "this conception of God as the writer" "probably reflects the prestigious connection of writing with government, priesthood and nobility". Carr, *Tablet*, 119–20.

<sup>539</sup> Carr, *Tablet*, 120.

<sup>540</sup> Young, "Israelite Literacy 1," 248.

<sup>541</sup> Ibid., 248–9.

<sup>542</sup> Ibid., 249.

<sup>543</sup> Young says that "being read to was a normal way of 'reading' in antiquity and implies nothing about the literacy of the person being read to". Ibid.

commanded to prepare a scroll and to write prophetic messages from Yahweh about ‘Israel, Judah, and all the nations’ (Jer 36:2b). Baruch is summoned to write what Jeremiah dictates on the scroll with ink, and then the scribe writes the first scroll (v. 4). However, because of hostility from unknown sources against Jeremiah, he is prohibited to enter to the temple, and consequently Baruch is immediately sent to read the scroll in the temple (vv. 5-6). Afterwards, when officials invite Baruch to read the scroll and ask with startling reaction how it has been written, Baruch witnesses: Jeremiah ‘dictated all those words to me, and I wrote them down on the scroll with ink’ (v. 18). After the first scroll is burned by the king Jehoiakim, Yahweh comes up on Jeremiah again and commands him to write the second scroll which includes the same content in the first scroll (v. 28), and consequently Baruch reproduces the second edition with many additions (v. 32). No other places in the Hebrew Bible describe how prophetic oracles come to a recorded document like Jeremiah 36, and though we cannot presume that the writing process of other biblical books went through the same steps, it may be presumed that it would not be much different. Here, it is surprising that the role of the scribe is not restricted into copying a text as a penman, but is expanded to adding a supplementary to the initial oracle (Jer 36:32b). What is more, this example may be in all probability linked to portraying the function of scribes involved in producing biblical literature in the late period. This does not mean that this story is fictitious. Rather, there is credible evidence to consider that the description of Jeremiah’s dictation may have been based on a factual event between the two historical figures.<sup>544</sup> However, at the same time, we should be cautious in accepting all the details of the story at face value. What we need to see behind this text is that this narrative could have reflected the scribal practice in the exilic and post-exilic period in preserving and inventing scriptural texts. Let us at first see the theory of the compositional process of the book of Jeremiah.

---

<sup>544</sup> Joachim Schaper, “On Writing and Reciting in Jeremiah 36,” in *Prophecy in the Book of Jeremiah*, ed. Hans M. Barstad and Reinhard Gregor Kratz, BZAW 388 (Berlin; NY: Walter de Gruyter, 2009), 137–47.

Yahweh's words in Jer 36 at first come to the prophet in 605 BCE ('in the fourth year of Jehoiakim') to prepare and write the oracle, while in Jer 1:2 ('in the thirteenth year of Josiah'), the time of oracle dates back to 627 BCE and the record continues until the eleventh year of Zedekiah in 587 BCE (cf. Jer 39:2). Namely, Jeremiah's life and ministry in the book cover the time of the reform of king Josiah, the destruction of Jerusalem in 587, and beyond. But the theory of composition of the book of Jeremiah has evinced a growing possibility of a long-duration editorial process by reorganising and expanding the prototype of Jeremiah. From the description of Jeremiah's first two scrolls in chap 36, interpreters have in general agreed on the fact that Jeremiah underwent extensive editions until the Persian period, although they have suggested different modes of redaction. Like Isaiah and Ezekiel, the book of Jeremiah has been regarded as 'an anthology of anthologies' (Craigie) or as 'a book of books' (Lundbom), rather than as 'a single book': for example, see references in 25:1-14; 30:1-2; 46:1.<sup>545</sup> Moreover, the diversity of genres such as 'poetic oracles', 'biographical narrative', 'discourses', and 'historical appendix', and the change of the abrupt literary styles have led scholars to suppose that there were later redactors.<sup>546</sup>

In such a possibility of a long-term redaction, it is widely accepted that there was the earliest scroll of the prophet Jeremiah—possibly, Jer 1-6 about the first scroll and 7-10 about the second scroll—although it is impossible to delimit its core extent from later material, and that this prototype might be known to the Israelite community.<sup>547</sup> The earliest part which was written down, after Jeremiah delivered it in public, would probably go through additions and editions by Baruch and later anonymous editors (cf. Jer 32); in particular, part of the biographical accounts about Jeremiah. Then, later editors as Deuteronomists may have

---

<sup>545</sup> Peter C. Craigie, Page H. Kelley, and Joel F. Drinkard, *Jeremiah 1-25*, WBC 26 (Dallas: Word Books, 1991), xxxii.

<sup>546</sup> Rainer Albertz, *Israel in Exile: The History and Literature of the Sixth Century B.C.E.*, SBL 3 (Atlanta: SBL, 2003), 304.

<sup>547</sup> e.g., see Holladay, *Jeremiah 2*, 16–20.

reconstructed the poetic and narrative of Jeremiah, adding new portions to it (e.g., Jer 52). Winfried Thiel argues that Jeremiah 1-45 was once redacted by ‘a Deuteronomistic book of Jeremiah’ around 550 BCE (excluding foreign nation oracles in Jer 46-51).<sup>548</sup> The adherents to support the hypothesis of deuteronomistic edition have developed Thiel’s theory with challenging alternatives.<sup>549</sup> For instance, Rainer Albertz modifies Thiel’s theory and divides deuteronomistic redactions into two major stages: (1) several deuteronomistic redactions in the exilic period (587-520 BCE); (2) the post-deuteronomistic additions in the post-exilic period (5<sup>th</sup>- 3<sup>th</sup> BCE).<sup>550</sup> Finally, it should be noticed that there are two different ancient versions of the book of Jeremiah; Greek LXX and the MT. The Septuagint version of Jeremiah is one-eighth shorter than the Hebrew MT—they are different in the arrangement of 26-45 and 46-51—so that the Greek version has been accepted as being older than the MT, because of its longer passages.<sup>551</sup> This probably presents the existence of at least two different revisions that were rewritten and restructured by different editors. Therefore, from this history of the growth of Jeremiah, it would be reasonable to suppose that the present form of Jeremiah was to a great extent different from the authoritative prototype of Jeremiah’s scrolls. Namely, if the early part of Jeremiah has been compiled by the work of the later editors who was strongly influenced by deuteronomistic texts, the context of the large scale of Jeremiah would be more likely to go back to the later theological reflections than to the earliest part spoken/written by the prophet.

---

<sup>548</sup> See Albertz, *Israel in Exile*, 304. Winfried Thiel, *Die Deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1-25*, Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament Bd. 41 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1973); *Die Deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 26-45*, Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament Bd. 52 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981).

<sup>549</sup> Holladay, *Jeremiah 2*; Hermann-Josef Stipp, “Probleme Des Redaktionsgeschichtlichen Modells Der Entstehung Des Jeremiabuches,” in *Jeremia Und Die “Deuteronomistische Bewegung,”* ed. Walter Gross, Bonner biblische Beiträge Bd. 98 (Weinheim: Beltz, Athenäum, 1995), 225–62.

<sup>550</sup> Albertz, *Israel in Exile*, 311. For the post-deuteronomistic addition, see Erhard Gerstenberger, *Israel in the Persian Period: The Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.E.* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 327–37.

<sup>551</sup> David M. Carr, *An Introduction to the Old Testament: Sacred Texts and Imperial Contexts of the Hebrew Bible* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 160–1. Albertz, *Israel in Exile*, 312, however, says that “since the two textual traditions did not diverge until the fourth or third century, the LXX does not lead us directly to the ‘original’ text in any case”.

With theories about the compositional history of Jeremiah, the authenticity of the narrative in Jer 36 has been called into question. Scholars have used this chapter to explain the origin of the book of Jeremiah and to determine the extent of two scrolls which might be written by Baruch (Dhum, Weiser, and Holland).<sup>552</sup> In particular, although the book of Jeremiah gives significant references to Baruch (Jer 32, 43, and 45), Baruch has been regarded as a fictional figure developed in the later period. For instance, Robert Carroll regards Baruch as ‘a deuteronomistic creation in order to carry certain elements in the tradition’.<sup>553</sup> He argues that Jeremiah’s writing process with Baruch is ‘part of a symbolic act’ and concludes that ‘the thesis that 36 represents the taking over of the tradition by the Deuteronomistic scribal school cannot be ruled out altogether’.<sup>554</sup> Ernest Nicholson likewise argues that ‘it is a mistake to interpret it merely as biographical’ and the literary purpose of this narrative is ‘theological’, and that this ‘was composed by a Deuteronomic author’.<sup>555</sup> On the contrary, other scholars have advocated its historicity. William Holladay says that ‘the presumed Deuteronomistic phrases in this chapter are clearly part of Jeremiah’s diction’.<sup>556</sup> Jack Lundbom says that ‘the chapter is filled with precise times and locations, numerous names and patronyms, and other circumstantial details that only an eyewitness or someone having spoken to an eyewitness could report’.<sup>557</sup> Gerald Keown also argues that this chapter ‘gives Baruch a major role and should not be passed over too quickly’.<sup>558</sup>

---

<sup>552</sup> Refer to Gerald L. Keown, Pamela J. Scalise, and Thomas G. Smothers, *Jeremiah 26-52*, WBC 27 (Dallas: Word Books, 1995), 202.

<sup>553</sup> Robert P. Carroll, *From Chaos to Covenant: Prophecy in the Book of Jeremiah* (NY: Crossroad, 1981), 151.

<sup>554</sup> Robert P. Carroll, *Jeremiah: A Commentary*, OTL (London: SCM, 1986), 665–6.

<sup>555</sup> Ernest W. Nicholson, ed., *The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah, Chapters 26-52* (London: Cambridge UP, 1975), 104.

<sup>556</sup> Holladay, *Jeremiah 2*, 253.

<sup>557</sup> Jack R. Lundbom, *Jeremiah 21-36: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 21B (NY: Doubleday, 2004), 584.

<sup>558</sup> Keown, Scalise, and Smothers, *Jeremiah 26-52*, 202.

Considering the debate of the historicity of Jer 36, we should not readily reject the existence of Baruch as a royal scribe. Nevertheless, this story should not be exclusively identified as an account of a series of historical events relating to Jeremiah and Baruch. As Carroll mentioned, Yahweh in Jer 36:2, 28 does not command Jeremiah to appoint Baruch to be an official writer for the prophetic oracle. Then, all the questions come up. Why did the prophet not interpret the divine order literally? Why did the scribe add something into the original version of prophecy? The narrative in Jer 36 frequently has been compared with 2 Kgs 22:3-23:24 that deals with the finding of the book of Law in the temple (2 Kgs 22:8), in that both passages express the unexpected publication of unknown or unwritten materials to the nation and to the king. Charles Isbell gives literary links between these two materials and concludes that the author of Jer 36 had ‘a literary document chronicling the events’ stated in Kgs 22-23 and that he ‘would design his own description of the reaction of King Jehoiakim to portray such an obvious contrast to King Josiah’.<sup>559</sup> While he rather seems to jump to a hasty decision, Isbell’s analysis shows possible clues that Jer 36 is a well-structured account by a deuteronomistic editor.<sup>560</sup> But, neither does this mean that all the editions were done by a circle of deuteronomists nor that all the redactors were exclusively full of the theology of the Deuteronomistic history. What we need to notice is that this may well affirm that the author of Jer 36 could have an individual theological concern of Yahweh’s judgment of Judah and of potential forgiveness.

More interestingly, it is likely that Baruch’s role in Jeremiah’s dictation could provide important hints about the activity of scribes, apart from the issue of its authenticity.<sup>561</sup> For instance, Van der Toorn maintains that the narrative in Jer 36 ‘has been designed as proof of the

---

<sup>559</sup> Charles D. Isbell, “2 Kings 22:3-23:24 and Jeremiah 36: A Stylistic Comparison,” *JSOT*, no. 8 (1978): 43.

<sup>560</sup> Cf. Carroll says: “Such structured accounts are literary and theological constructs rather than eyewitness reports of historical events. The roots of the creation of the figure of Baruch are to be found in the Jeremiah tradition (as are those of Jeremiah), but that figure develops considerably in later literature”. Carroll, *Jeremiah*, 45.

<sup>561</sup> J. Andrew Dearman, “On Writing and Reciting in Jeremiah 36,” *JBL* 109, no. 3 (1990): 403–4.

authenticity of an early scroll of Jeremiah oracles'.<sup>562</sup> He applies three observations concerning producing the prophetic text in Jer 36 to a general model into which prophetic books emerged.<sup>563</sup> In other words, Baruch 'represents a larger community of followers and sympathizers' of the prophet, 'many of whom were scribes by profession' (36:26; 36:32; 43:2-3).<sup>564</sup> He doubts that Baruch wrote the oracles that the prophet delivered—'over a period of some twenty years' (Jer 36:2)—and holds that 'prophets were not in the habit of writing their messages', nor 'they were accustomed to dictating them to others'.<sup>565</sup> Then, van der Toorn argues that 'his scribal education had trained his powers of memorization, and it is quite possible that for much of what he wrote he could consult his own memory' and that 'it was part of a group culture in which the acts and oracles of Jeremiah were an important topic of conversation and discussion'.<sup>566</sup> Finally, he says that the fact that the second scroll is written up with many supplementary words (36:32), implies that 'the legitimizing narrative of Jer 36:27:32 is a witness to the textual growth of the Jeremiah tradition'.<sup>567</sup>

Many points van der Toorn suggests are more or less convincing, and if we admit this approach, the narrative of Jeremiah and Baruch in Jer 36 may be appreciated as reflecting the characteristics of the scribal activities such as 'transcription, invention, and expansion'.<sup>568</sup> This is a highly possible reading of Jer 36, without dismissing the authenticity of the story of Jeremiah's dictation. If scribes were the literati knowing authoritative sources of the tradition of Jeremiah and involving the production of the book of Jeremiah, this story of the description of

---

<sup>562</sup> van der Toorn, *Scribal*, 184.

<sup>563</sup> (1) The composer "is a professional scribe from the entourage of the prophet"; (2) the oracles "are the written recollections of oral performance of the prophet"; (3) the written collection "that survives is not the original scroll but a rewritten one to which many things have been added". See *ibid.*, 184–5.

<sup>564</sup> *Ibid.*, 185.

<sup>565</sup> *Ibid.*, 186.

<sup>566</sup> "The oral tradition that Jer 36:2 might imply does not exceed twenty years." See *ibid.*, 186.

<sup>567</sup> *Ibid.*, 187.

<sup>568</sup> *Ibid.*, 188.



scribal practice is most likely mirroring how scribes function in manufacturing biblical literature.

### 4.3 *Education, Textuality, and Enculturation*

In this argument of scribes, furthermore, one may find the substantial notion of scribal culture in which the literate experts are educated and enculturated and in which they produced and disseminated texts by utilising and reflecting a wide range of cultural memory in their own time. Namely, ‘scribal culture’ is not only about working as a ‘scribe’, but also about having the intellectual capacity and practising them for the purpose of general education. For this, I will present two researches raised by David Carr and Karel van der Toorn.

#### 4.3.1 David Carr

Carr in *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart*, citing Susan Niditch’s critique of documentary hypothesis using literary sources (J, E, D, P), challenges redactional theories about the textual production and transmission of biblical books, and then argues that the Hebrew Bible has been formed in the intricate oral-literary process, as engraving the heart of a literate élite in the educational context where students memorized, studied, and discussed biblical materials. The main issue in this book is to testify that ‘the element of visual presentation of texts is but one indicator of the distinctive function of written copies of long-duration texts like Bible’, and that ‘both writing and oral performance fed into the process of indoctrination/education/enculturation’.<sup>569</sup> Contrary to the Parry-Lord school, Carr insists that ‘societies with writing often have an intricate interplay of orality and textuality, where written texts are intensely oral, while even exclusively oral texts are deeply affected by written culture.’<sup>570</sup> Based on this symbiosis of textuality and orality from the ancient Near Eastern

---

<sup>569</sup> Carr, *Tablet*, 5.

<sup>570</sup> Carr says that “cultures interested in preserving the integrity of the tradition can use a variety of means to preserve it, including both different uses of writing and intense implementation of older means

world, he asserts that ‘scribal recollection of early traditions was ensured partly through teaching students to read and reproduce written copies of the key traditions’.<sup>571</sup> Furthermore, he emphasises the ‘cultural memory’ in a social group that ‘consists of a body of recollections transmitted in organized ways to participants in a given group, recollections of values and views that shape each individual into a member of the group’.<sup>572</sup> In this broad picture, he says that the social group which used such a cultural memory in this dynamic transmission and production of biblical texts belongs to a literate community; he says that ‘although many élite leaders might not achieve significant mastery of the oral-written tradition, we would still recognize that the scribe/priests/teachers who stood at the top of the educational pyramid did achieve such mastery’.<sup>573</sup>

As comparative evidence, Carr examines how literal and oral traditions in several ancient Near Eastern cultures function in inscribing the minds on learners and in shaping the identities of literate experts; the explorations of education and textuality in each culture present the existence of the group of the intellectual élite. He compares the educational system and textual production in other cultures with those of Israel, and concentrates on the educational context in pre-Hellenistic Israel, confirming how a literate group used the prototype of the Hebrew Bible for the purpose of educating young elites. He says:

*[S]uch biblical texts only joined the stream of long-duration usage when they were used to educate and enculturate young elites, a usage relatively consistent with later Jewish educational use of the Bible. From the earliest period of their use ‘as Scripture’, such (proto)biblical texts served as authoritative reference texts for use in education of literate elites in Israel.*<sup>574</sup>

---

of aiding recall—formulae, rhyming, link of text to music and movement, use of overarching themes, memory techniques, and so on.” Ibid., 7.

<sup>571</sup> Ibid., 9.

<sup>572</sup> Ibid., 11.

<sup>573</sup> Ibid., 288.

<sup>574</sup> Ibid., 112.

According to Carr, both the epigraphic and textual clues from the Hebrew Bible demonstrate in the pre-Hellenistic period the existence of professional scribes, and the Bible having ‘a complex collection of texts from widely different periods’ is regarded as ‘a form of cultural reproduction that is intensely textual’.<sup>575</sup> More cautiously, he attempts to refine the model of scribal education; while education in Judah and Israel would take place in a small-scale environment such as in the family, rather than in the large scale environment of separate schools, he strongly maintains that such small kingdoms like Israel and Judah ‘did maintain a scribal-education apparatus’.<sup>576</sup> Building on this theory, he states the connections between scribal education/textuality and biblical materials; from wisdom literature (esp. Proverbs) to Deuteronomy/the Deuteronomistic history, prophetic books, and Torah, Psalms, etc. As these books were used as the educational curriculum to enculturate young elites, scribes in this framework rewrote and revised them during a long period. At this point, his view of the development of the Hebrew Bible would be in line with the direction of my research; suggesting that overlapping elements between Job/Deutero-Isaiah and other biblical texts can be best understood in the model of scribal writing and that such a process of textuality gives a reason to alert the traditional theory of literary reference. He says:

*[I]t is increasingly clear how much of Israelite literature is likewise “intertextual.” But it is not intertextual in the sense that early Israelite authors were constantly engaged in a process of visually consulting, citing, and interpreting separate written texts. ... The literature bears clear marks of this process, and these marks have provided the basis for theories such as the documentary hypothesis for the creation of the Pentateuch or the multiple authorship of books like Isaiah. Yet such “sources” generally were not incorporated in written form, nor did editors juggle multiple copies of manuscripts in the process of producing their conflated text. It is possible that a scribe may have worked with a given manuscript on occasion. ... Nevertheless, well-educated scribes often could write out a verbatim, memorized form of an older authoritative text, so faithfully reproducing it that its borders and clashes with other material would still be visible in the final product.<sup>577</sup>*

---

<sup>575</sup> Ibid., 112.

<sup>576</sup> Ibid., 115.

<sup>577</sup> Ibid., 159.

Although scribes might consult earlier written sources, the scribal skills learned by verbatim memorization and recitation ‘having multiple texts “inscribes on [his or her] heart”’,<sup>578</sup> do not necessitate visual consultation of other copies, and scribes ‘would have drawn on their verbatim memory of other texts’ in alluding to, quoting, and echoing them.<sup>579</sup> Carr extensively outlines several examples of how biblical literature as educational and enculturational texts emerged in the history of Israel over several centuries. Concerning the time of writing of the major form in the Pentateuch, he proposes ‘the Davidic-Solomonic period’, ‘as the time of emergence of city-state structures’ and there would be ‘literate bureaucrats from pre-Israelite Jerusalem’.<sup>580</sup> Nevertheless, he says that ‘there is no indication of special efforts toward stabilizing the tradition’,<sup>581</sup> and concludes that ‘the exilic period was hardly the time for a radical expansion of Israel literacy’, and that ‘any expansion in percentage of literacy probably came more from the postexilic redefinition’, ‘of what constituted as “Israelite” rather than major increases in access to literate education’.<sup>582</sup>

#### 4.3.2 Karel van der Toorn

Other research has been done by Karel van der Toorn who, in his book, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible*, more directly focuses on the writing activity of the literate élites in the Second Temple period. Similar to Carr’s view, he argues that the Hebrew Bible has been formed by the writing group of the professional scribal élite; providing internal, external, and comparative evidence of Hebrew scribal activity.<sup>583</sup> He notices that scribal culture in

---

<sup>578</sup> Ibid., 160.

<sup>579</sup> Ibid., 162.

<sup>580</sup> e.g., “the song of Deborah, the emergence of an early Israelite corpus of royal and Zion Psalms, the development of early collections of poems like the often-cited book of Yashar (Josh 10:12-13; 2 Sam 1:18)”, “parts of Proverbs”, “early forms of the creation-flood narratives and narratives centering on figures like Jacob, Moses, and David.” Ibid., 163.

<sup>581</sup> Ibid., 164.

<sup>582</sup> Ibid., 172–3. Even Carr supposes that “the Mosaic Torah traditions at Qumran testify to an ongoing, highly dynamic process of oral-written use and transmission of the Torah”. Ibid., 171.

<sup>583</sup> Internal evidence is “associated with the redaction criticism of the Bible: editorial expansions, scribal annotations, seams and incongruities in the text, and the like”. External evidence is related to

Mesopotamia and Egypt indicates that scribes, whose offices were mostly hereditary, were scholars working in temple institutes ('workshop' and 'library') and they possessed expertise in their own areas.<sup>584</sup> In the same way, scribes in Israel were wise men and royal officials, secretaries, and scholars as well as composers of literature and possibly worked in the temple as the centre of literacy rather than in the royal palace.<sup>585</sup>

In particular, van der Toorn deals in Chapter 4 with the role of scribes in the production of biblical literature and proposes six techniques in which scribes revised and made biblical books: (1) 'transcription of oral lore'; (2) 'invention of a new text'; (3) 'compilation of existing lore'; (4) 'expansion of an inherited texts'; (5) 'adaptation of an existing text for a new audience'; (6) 'integration of individual documents into a more comprehensive composition'.<sup>586</sup> However, this approach of scribal skills in producing texts seems to presuppose that Hebrew scribes could have access to written and separate sources from a sort of central archive like a temple library. He presents an example of the scribal mode of integrating literary sources; e.g., the story of *Noah and the Flood* in Gen 6-9 integrates 'narratives from a Yahwistic document (J) and a priestly source (P)'.<sup>587</sup> In this point, van der Toorn's opinion of scribal activity is to some degree different from that of Niditch and Carr saying that although scribes might use those visual copies and might carry out separate scrolls for adding new materials to their training curriculum, they were more likely to produce them from the internalised memory of earlier oral-written texts.<sup>588</sup>

---

extrabiblical material like "epigraphic discoveries", "the accounts of later writers" like Josephus, evidence in the Qumran scrolls, Septuagint, and Apocrypha. Comparative evidence is derived from the date on the scribal culture which appeared in the ancient Near Eastern texts. van der Toorn, *Scribal*, 1–8.

<sup>584</sup> Ibid., 52–71.

<sup>585</sup> Ibid., 75–108.

<sup>586</sup> Ibid., 110.

<sup>587</sup> Ibid., 140.

<sup>588</sup> See Carr, *Tablet*, 159–60; Susan Niditch, *Oral World and Written Word: Ancient Israelite Literature* (London: SPCK, 1997), 113.

In order to demonstrate scribal culture in biblical materials, van der Toorn looks at the book of Deuteronomy and the book of Jeremiah to reflect theological concerns of the scribes during the centuries.<sup>589</sup> He holds that Deuteronomy is ‘the end product of more than 200 years of scribal activity’ and went through four major revisions/editions.<sup>590</sup> In the case of the prophetic books, there would exist the earliest collections (in Micah, Isaiah, Jeremiah) in the pre-exilic period; with extra-biblical evidence like ‘the book of Balaam discovered in 1967 at Deir Alla’.<sup>591</sup> However, he insists that ‘their purpose in writing’ ‘was confined to communicating a message to their contemporaries’, but that the prophetic books ‘were composed for an audience that would consult them after the prophets had gone’.<sup>592</sup>

The nature of scribal activity which van der Toorn presents is similar to Carr’s view, in that both explain the textuality and production of biblical literature in the framework of professional training and an educational system, and highlight the long cumulative process of writing texts. The cultural and shared memory transmitted and trained by the Persian literati about the history of Israel, narratives, instructions, and oracles functions in reproducing and producing biblical texts.<sup>593</sup> Carr’s view, however, is more distinguished by highlighting the dynamic interplay between ‘textuality’, ‘education’ and ‘enculturation’ than that of van der Toorn. Such an emphasis not only on the function of a scribal class in making literature, but also on the idea of enculturation, that scribal education cultivates the hearts/minds of learners, increasingly may allow us to regard biblical literature as cultural texts of the literati.

---

<sup>589</sup> van der Toorn, *Scribal*, 143–204.

<sup>590</sup> *Ibid.*, 144.

<sup>591</sup> *Ibid.*, 175.

<sup>592</sup> *Ibid.*, 182.

<sup>593</sup> For instance, Ehud Ben Zvi discusses prophetic memories in “Persian period Jerusalem-centered literati”. He says that Deuteronomic and prophetic collections served “as tools for didactic instruction and socialization among the literati who produced, read, and reread them, and likely—through the intermediation of these literati—for other groups in Yehud as well” and that “these collections could serve such a role because reading these collections brought to the present of their rereading communities memories of the past and of the characters that populated it”. See Ben Zvi, “Prophetic Memories in the Deuteronomistic Historical and the Prophetic Collections of Books,” 75.

#### 4.4 *Summary*

What I have discussed is that scribes were possibly the literati of oral-written texts who were equipped to transmit and produce literature. Although many have mentioned the professional group of scribes employed around the Jerusalem temple or palace, scribalism in the Second Temple period does not have to be only limited to the governmental power. This picture of scribal culture considerably corresponds to scribal activity and textuality in Egyptian and Mesopotamian culture; though there are differences between them. It is also important to recognise that since Jews in the fifth century BCE were already located in Egypt and Babylon, the great centres of the learned literati would be outside Israel. Furthermore, one could argue that because of this rarity of textual evidence of scribal activity, the biblical literature does not belong to scribes. Nonetheless, it should be stressed that when the biblical text speaks of ‘to write’ and ‘to read’ by someone, the interpretation of those records calls for a great deal of attention. First, literacy in Israel and Judah was generally limited to a small literate group and was not widespread until the Hellenistic period. Secondly, although biblical texts like Jer 36 are partly dependent on historical events and figures, it is quite possible to confirm the existence of scribes as scriptural writers from the narrative.

Consequently, scribal culture in writing texts and in educating the next generation could be appreciated as diversified traditions, behaviour patterns, and values performed by the literati. As Carr highlighted, the scribal practice in collecting and producing texts was developed in the dynamic process of textuality and enculturation. Nevertheless, the view of the scribal culture should be no reason to overlook the primeval context before the formation of a biblical book. This study is not intended to exclude the fact that the biblical texts existed in earlier forms whether oral or written texts, before scribes manufactured the present form of biblical materials; i.e., the early form of the Deuteronomistic history, the early prophetic oracle (e.g., Hosea, Amos, Micah, Zephaniah, Nahum, and Jeremiah), the royal Psalms, the early form of wisdom corpus

(Proverbs collections, the prose-tale of Job, part of Ecclesiastes), etc. However, what I am concerned with is how scribes in their ‘cultural memory’<sup>594</sup> integrated them in a new context for their contemporaries, recreated them with their theological agenda, and expanded them with new materials. If a biblical literature named as a book may not have been the product of a single author, but necessarily may have undergone extensive modifications and revisions over many centuries, scribes in making biblical literature could utilise their knowledge of what they had read, learned, studied, and memorised from their authoritative collections. In this respect, what I treat here has not been related to the context of the prototype in the earlier materials, but to the broad context which the literati shared and entertained.

#### 4.5 *Further Discussion: Sages, Prophets, and Scribal Culture*

Much of what has been discussed in terms of scribal culture as the principal explanation of making biblical literature has been accepted among a few scholars. Nonetheless, a large number of interpreters have kept a traditional approach, so that this has resulted in many debates in looking at the context behind biblical literature. If this is so, what has prevented them from realising the significance of scribal culture? Why has the notion of scribal culture not been widely adopted?

In discussions of the cultural background of the Hebrew Bible, scholars used to suggest literary traditions inherited in a priestly, a prophetic, and a wisdom context. Related to our concern in Job and Deutero-Isaiah, both ‘wisdom’ and ‘prophecy’ have become key factors in defining each literary characteristic. Until now, it has been generally accepted that ‘wisdom’ lays out a way of life or refers to all sorts of skills, while ‘prophecy’ refers to the divine message ‘received and transmitted by the prophet’ to recipients.<sup>595</sup> Doubtless, it has been assumed that each literary tradition has different vocabularies, forms, styles, and themes, because each was

---

<sup>594</sup> I use this term from Carr, *Tablet*, 10.

<sup>595</sup> See M. A. Shields, “Wisdom and Prophecy,” ed. Tremper Longman III and Peter Enns, *DOTWPPW* (IVP, 2008), 876–7.



written by different social groups. The wisdom tradition is considered as a literary genre/form inherited by the group of sages (or ‘wise men’) and the prophetic tradition is demonstrated as the conventional literary style used by prophets or the followers of prophetic teachings. So, understanding the wisdom and prophetic context has been a conventional method of explaining the intellectual setting in wisdom and prophetic books. Such a notion about these literary traditions divided by separate social groups has made it difficult to adopt the social background of scribes. Although this does not mean that this conventional approach of two literary traditions is wholly unnecessary, the long-standing notion has been challenged in recent researches, and there are many reasons for putting more emphasis on the contribution of scribal culture, rather than on the wisdom and prophetic tradition.

#### 4.5.1 Sages as Biblical Writers

The existence of the sages as a professional class in Israelite/Judean society has been challenged, and the view that a sage group was potentially involved with writing activities of the wisdom corpus may be questionable. It has often been supposed that the author of Job was a sage, an educated graduate of an exiled community. Leo Perdue maintains that Job and his three friends were sages deeply rooted in the wisdom tradition and that ‘the book appears to be the composition of a sage’.<sup>596</sup> In this way, scholars have maintained that a group of ‘wise men’ represented a professional social group in the palace or temple trained in a wisdom school. Moreover, it has been noted that many similarities between prophetic texts and the wisdom corpus arise out of the social activity of the sage group, and that prophets might be in contact with a group of sages, or might be well acquainted with the classical teaching in the ‘wisdom circle’.<sup>597</sup> Johannes Fichtner claims that the group of sages was associated with the group of

---

<sup>596</sup> Perdue, *Wisdom Literature*, 90–1; *Sword*, 140, 147; Also see Samuel L. Terrien, “Job as a Sage,” in *Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 242.

<sup>597</sup> This is results of Lindblom’s investigation on this issue; Johannes Lindblom, “Wisdom in the Old Testament Prophets,” in *Wisdom in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Presented to Harold Henry Rowley by the Editorial Board of “Vetus Testamentum” in Celebration of His 65th Birthday, March*

royal consultants, and that even the prophet Isaiah originally was one of the sages.<sup>598</sup> William McKane, furthermore, asserts that there were two groups derived from an idea suggested by the two Hebrew words, *עצה* and *דבר* from 2 Sam 16:23; the secular group of sages who had ‘counsel’ and the prophetic group who sought advice from ‘the word of God’.<sup>599</sup> From the definition of ‘old wisdom’, he argues that there was an assault on secular sages in the royal court from a prophetic group like Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel (Isa 40:12-17, 28-31; 46:10-11);<sup>600</sup> the Hebrew words, *חכמים* in Isa 44:25 and *חכמתך* in 47:10, seem to become important indicators to support this assertion.

Examining all the claims and examples about the existence of sages as a professional social group is beyond the scope of this study. But, there are several reasons to make us question this supposition. Opposition to this traditional view, for instance, was advanced by R. N. Whybray. He examines passages including words *חכם* or *חכמים* and other cognate terms in the Hebrew Bible which are likely supposed to denote a designated professional class of ‘the wise man’. The analysis is given to the relation to three official professions of state; ‘the counsellor’ of kings, ‘the teacher’, and ‘the author’ of ‘wisdom literature’. He notices that the existence of the professional class of wise men in any designation is improbable, though it is not totally impossible. Stuart Weeks similarly claims that the term ‘wise men’ ‘is never used as a technical term for a group of Israelites, and although “wise” is found on a number of occasions in association with foreign royal officials or counsellors, no official Israelite counsellor was ever explicitly called “wise”’.<sup>601</sup>

---

1955, ed. Martin Noth and D. Winton Thomas (Brill, 1969), 192–204; Fichtner, “Isaiah”; Whedbee, *Isaiah*.

<sup>598</sup> Fichtner claims the “dual-orientation” of Isaiah that the prophet Isaiah belonged to a class of the wise, but after the divine calling he turned against the human wisdom of the political class and assailed it. See Fichtner, “Isaiah,” 436.

<sup>599</sup> See chapters 3-5; William McKane, *Prophets and Wise Men* (London: Trinity, 1984).

<sup>600</sup> *Ibid.*, 48–54.

<sup>601</sup> Weeks, *Early*, 90.

To some interpreters, this view might have been far from satisfactory, because we can observe a definite example from Jer 18:8 which is likely to signify a class of sages alongside priests and prophets:

וַיֹּאמְרוּ לָכֹוּ וְנַחֲשָׁבָה עַל־יִרְמְיָהוּ מַחֲשָׁבוֹת כִּי לֹא־תֵאבֵד תּוֹרָה מִכֶּהֶן וְעֵצָה מִחֲכָמִים וְדִבְרֵי מִנְבִּיִּא לָכֹוּ וְנִכְהוּ בַלְשׁוֹן וְאֶל־נִקְשִׁיבָה אֶל־כָּל־דִּבְרָיו

*Then they said: 'Come and let us devise plans against Jeremiah; for law shall not perish from the priest, nor counsel from the wise, nor oracle from the prophet. Com and let us strike him with the tongue, and let us not listen carefully to all his words.'* (Jer 18:18)

For instance, Crenshaw sees 'an allusion to three classes of leaders in ancient Israel' from Jer 18:8 and supports that from the derivatives of the Hebrew word חֲכָם, there was a professional leadership of sages in Israel, aside from highly-trained scribes.<sup>602</sup> However, designating sages as a social class from Jer 18:18 could be highly problematic. Jer 18:18 is located between two literary units in which Yahweh challenges Judah who had misbehaved (vv. 13-17) and Jeremiah pleads with Yahweh to punish the prophet's enemies and their families (vv. 19-23). However, neither unit seems to fit in with the middle statement in v. 18, though this verse could be included in the tradition of Jeremiah. In v. 18:18a, 'they' possibly mean 'people' referring to residents of Judah in v. 11-12, rather than Jeremiah's adversaries in v. 19 or the triad ('the priest', 'the wise', 'the prophet') in v. 18.<sup>603</sup> They 'the Judean' here are making a scheme in opposition to Jeremiah. The difficult part is the interpretation of the subordinate clause with conjunction וְ. The most probable interpretation is that Jeremiah is attacked and threatened by the Judean people saying that law, counsel, and oracle shall not cease, because Jeremiah has condemned the official and religious groups (priests, wise men, and prophets) of the nation in

---

<sup>602</sup> James L. Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom: An Introduction*, 3rd ed. (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2010), 24–5. Furthermore, there is the strong tendency for Crenshaw to think of sages as "educators" or "teachers" and to see the works of scribes as fundamentally educational; when he speaks about a sage group, he consistently thinks more of biblical writers. James L. Crenshaw, *Education in Ancient Israel: Across the Deadening Silence*, ABRL (NY: Doubleday, 1998).

<sup>603</sup> Carroll, *Jeremiah*, 378.

his early prophetic messages; king, officials, priests, prophets, and wise men have been under accusation in Jer 4:9 and 8:9.<sup>604</sup>

Then, from this approach, is it possible to verify that Jeremiah is attacked by the professional class of ‘wise men’? If this expression denying the cessation of the law (תורה) from the priest (כהן), of the counsel (עצה) from the wise (חכם), and of the word (דבר) from the prophet (נביא) is intended to remark the professional class of ‘wise men’, this should be applied to other similar expressions. A similar pattern is found in Ezek 7:26—‘though they seek a vision from the prophet, the law perishes from the priest, and counsel from the elders’—but, ‘wise men’ in connection with ‘counsel’ in Jer 18:18 appears as being replaced by ‘elders’ (זקנים).<sup>605</sup> Thus, biblical texts concerning this threefold expression do not give consistent evidence to support the social class of ‘wise men’.<sup>606</sup> Interpreters at this point have often argued that this threefold phrase said in opposition to Jeremiah is most likely to be a well-known saying to be quoted, rather than refer to three kinds of social classes.<sup>607</sup>

What is more, Jer 18:18 has been treated as a later addition introducing the next unit of lament (vv. 19-23).<sup>608</sup> If this verse echoes a later idea about three social classes, we might read it in the post-exilic situation as well as in the late pre-exilic condition. Carroll in this threefold statement views Jeremiah ‘as a solitary figure standing for the divine word in opposition to the social structures which constituted the normal media of teaching authority in the community’, and concludes that ‘v. 18 should be read as a fragment of struggle between different parties and

---

<sup>604</sup> R. N. Whybray, *The Intellectual Tradition in the Old Testament*, BZAW 135 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1974), 25–6.

<sup>605</sup> An example from *ibid.*, 29.

<sup>606</sup> Also refer to Weeks, *Early*, 87–90.

<sup>607</sup> Whybray says: “The conspirators in Jer 18:18 reflect this attitude of contempt, and quote the saying to persuade themselves that they have nothing to fear from Jeremiah words.” Whybray, *Intellectual*, 30. Also see Craigie, Kelley, and Drinkard, *Jeremiah 1-25*, 253.

<sup>608</sup> Jack R. Lundbom, *Jeremiah 1-20: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 21A (NY: Doubleday, 1999), 824; Carroll, *Jeremiah*, 378–9. On the contrary, Craigie, Kelley, and Drinkard, *Jeremiah 1-25*, 252.

opposing ideologies of a later period' (cf. 23:9-12).<sup>609</sup> Apart from Carroll's reading in the post-exilic setting, it is likely that the adversaries' schemes in this verse portray the situation after king Jehoiakim burned Jeremiah's first scroll,<sup>610</sup> so that there might be a professional class of sages in a late pre-exilic period. Nevertheless, as Carr argues, no firm evidence for this appears from other biblical texts 'in the periods preceding or following the late pre-exilic'.<sup>611</sup> Accordingly, treating 'wise men' as a professional class, alongside prophets and priests in the early history of Israel and in the post-exilic period would be less persuasive.

Besides, there is little evidence to support the claim that the professional class of wise men produced wisdom literature. Whybray searches all the relevant passages which are associated with 'wise men' denoting a specific group of authors; the plural form with a definite article (Exod 36:4; 2 Chr 2:6; Eccl 9:1), with the suffix (Gen 41:8; Esther 6:13; Isa 19:12; Jer 50:35; 51:57; Ezra 27:8, 9; 2 Chr 2:13; Isa 29:14), other cases which cannot decide whether it is noun or adjective (Exod 7:11; Esther 1:13; Eccl 9:11; Prov 24:23).<sup>612</sup> But, he does not find any internal evidence in the Hebrew Bible to consider sages as a distinct writing group of biblical books like wisdom corpus; saying that the link between 'wise men' and wisdom literature (Prov 22:17; 1:6; Job 15:17-19) does not mean that they were 'professional authors or teachers'.<sup>613</sup> Disproving such an assumption, he maintains that the wisdom corpus was composed in an intellectual tradition transmitted by an educated and intellectual society.<sup>614</sup> Again, one may claim that the wisdom corpus was written by sages from the linguistic connection between

---

<sup>609</sup> Carroll, *Jeremiah*, 378–9.

<sup>610</sup> William L. Holladay, *Jeremiah 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Chapters 1-25*, ed. Paul D. Hanson, *Hermeneia--A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), 530.

<sup>611</sup> David M. Carr, *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible a New Reconstruction* (NY: Oxford UP, 2011), 406.

<sup>612</sup> Whybray, *Intellectual*, 48–54.

<sup>613</sup> *Ibid.*, 53–4.

<sup>614</sup> *Ibid.*, 54, 70. On the contrary, Raymond C. Van Leeuwen, "The Sage in the Prophetic Literature," in *Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 295–306 holds the position of McKane.

‘wise men’ and ‘counsel’ (עצה) in Jer 18:18. However, another reference found in Jer 8:8 associates ‘wise men’ with ‘the law of Yahweh’ (תורת יהוה), which is linked with ‘priests’ in Jer 18:18. This evinces that the link between ‘wise men’ and ‘counsel’ is not so consistent that we can designate a group of sages to composing the wisdom books.<sup>615</sup> The simple use of the noun חכם or חכמה therefore would not prove the existence of a professional class of “wise men” in Israel, nor would present sages as writers of a wisdom corpus.

#### 4.5.2 Prophets as Biblical Writers

It is certain in Israelite history that there were writing ‘prophets’, plausibly a class of prophets as biblical writers, and followers of prophetic teaching who supposedly preserved and transmitted prophetic tradition. Crenshaw maintains that there were self-sustaining disciples of classical prophets who could transmit prophetic oracles to future generations, just as the group of ‘wise men’ plays an important role in preserving and transmitting the wisdom corpus.<sup>616</sup> A prophetic group which would make the transcription of prophetic oracles and preserve them could probably be treated as a social context in prophetic literature. Differing from the critique of a professional class of ‘wise men’, we may postulate the existence of a prophetic group in and after the monarchy.

However, the traditional view that prophets were writers of prophetic books has increasingly been challenged. There are difficulties in pinning down the precise social setting of given prophetic books, in that as scholars argue, there were textual redactions and expansions from earlier prophetic collections.<sup>617</sup> There seems to have been confusion in recognising the

---

<sup>615</sup> Holladay, *Jeremiah I*, 530.

<sup>616</sup> See James L. Crenshaw, “Transmitting Prophecy across Generations,” in *Writings and Speech in Israelite and Ancient Near Eastern Prophecy*, ed. Ehud Ben Zvi and Michael H. Floyd, SBLSS no. 10 (Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2000), 31–44.

<sup>617</sup> Davies disagrees with a Gunkel’s model that considers “prophecy” as the result of transcriptions of prophetic oracles. See Philip R. Davies, “‘Pen of Iron, Point of Diamond’ (Jer 17:1): Prophecy as Writing,” in *Writings and Speech in Israelite and Ancient Near Eastern Prophecy*, ed. Ehud Ben Zvi and Michael H. Floyd, SBLSS no. 10 (Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2000), 70–1. Gunkel’s model continues in John

difference between the social setting which prophetic books present at face value and the later context in which prophetic collections were actually edited and reproduced. Recent scholarship is more inclined to accept as true that the notion of ‘prophetic message’ and ‘prophecy’ lies at the root of the emerging literate group in the Persian period.<sup>618</sup> Of course, it would be valid to say that there were some writing prophets (Jeremiah, Isaiah, and Ezekiel) who had the intellectual ability to read and write texts, and that the prophetic oracles were recorded by them or their guild. Nonetheless, that does not always mean that prophets were writers of biblical prophetic books or were involved in making a prophetic literature. We cannot go back to all the details of this discussion about who the writers of prophetic texts were. Simply put, in discussion about the nature of prophecy and prophets, the view of the classical ‘prophets’ of Israel has been changed, and historical figures of prophetic books should certainly be distinguished from real writers of prophetic literature. Many regard prophetic literature as a literary phenomenon and prophets as created and constructed figures in a later period, probably, not earlier than the Persian period.<sup>619</sup> Davies, for instance, argues that prophetic oracles were possibly edited with historical narratives and revised in the national context of Israel.<sup>620</sup> He also argues that the original prophetic oracles delivered and sent to kings were preserved in archives of temple or palace (2 Chr 21:12) and then those collections were filed and copied under the name of the same individual or of an intermediary.<sup>621</sup> To the question ‘who were the writers of prophetic literature indicated in the present form’, he conclusively says that they were scribes;

*I have suggested, finally, that the emergence of the notion of “prophecy” as a social and theological institution (a series of men sent by God to remind his*

---

Van Seters, “Oral Patterns or Literary Conventions in Biblical Narrative,” *Semeia*, no. 5 (1976): 139–54; Michael H. Floyd, “Prophecy and Writing in Habakkuk 2,1-5,” *ZAW* 105, no. 3 (1994): 462–81.

<sup>618</sup> See Erhard Gerstenberger, “Persian-Empire Spirituality and the Genesis of Prophetic Books,” in *The Production of Prophecy: Constructing Prophecy and Prophets in Yehud*, ed. Diana Vikander Edelman and Ehud Ben Zvi, BibleWorld (London: Equinox, 2009), 111–30; Gerstenberger, *Persian*.

<sup>619</sup> See Robert R. Wilson, “Current Issues in the Study of Old Testament Prophecy,” in *Inspired Speech: Prophecy in the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of Herbert B. Huffmon*, ed. John Kaltner and Louis Stulman, JSOT (London; NY: T&T Clark, 2004), 39–41.

<sup>620</sup> See Davies, “Pen.”

<sup>621</sup> See *ibid.*, 71–5.

*people of their covenant obligations and warn them of impending consequences) was a result of scribal activity in both the Deuteronomistic history and some of the prophetic scrolls (e.g., Zechariah and Amos).<sup>622</sup>*

It would be more realistic to consider that the original prophetic scrolls in the process of textuality were contextualized into the historiographical sense and were fitted into the ‘prophetic literature’ in the Second Temple period.<sup>623</sup> Again, it would be hard to find the comprehensive evidence about the scribal practice in prophetic literature. Nonetheless, as seen in the compositional process of Jeremiah, if most prophetic books had gone through the redactional process for centuries and their later authors had been the well-educated literates who possessed a high level of textual knowledge, those editors of prophetic books might be described as scribes.

#### 4.5.3 Form Criticism and Scribal Culture

Let us take one more step in pointing out the weakness of understanding that sages and prophets were two separate groups. From where does the conception originate? Why does the majority still hold the long-standing view of two separate traditions? That there should be social contexts for different types of compositions that distinct professional groups as biblical authors produced is the foremost principle of form criticism. According to Hermann Gunkel, different genres are necessarily related to specific groups:

*Rather, literature was an integral part of the people’s daily life, and must be understood in this context. Thus, in order to understand an ancient genre, one first has to inquire about its context in the people’s life (Sitz im Volksleben): for example, a law would be cited by a judge in order to explain a certain legal decision in court, while a victory song would be sung by young girls at the return of the victorious army. Very frequently a particular genre was associated*

---

<sup>622</sup> See *ibid.*, 80; also, refer to Philip R. Davies, “The Audiences of Prophetic Scrolls: Some Suggestions,” in *Prophets and Paradigms: Essays in Honor of Gene M. Tucker*, ed. Stephen Breck Reid, JSOT 229 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996), 48–62.

<sup>623</sup> This argument that earlier forms of prophecy were reformulated in written forms has been supported by various comparative studies with Egyptian and Babylonian prophecy. See Ehud Ben Zvi and Michael H. Floyd, eds., *Writings and Speech in Israelite and Ancient Near Eastern Prophecy*, SBLSS 10 (Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2000).



*with a specific social group (Stand), which ensured the purity of the genre, such as the priests and their Torah, or the prophets and their oracles.*<sup>624</sup>

Gunkel's 'genre' necessarily comes along with distinct professional figures of ancient Israel who are involved with manufacturing biblical materials such as priestly documents, prophetic literature, and wisdom literature. It is true that those who adopt this theory are frequently used to describing a group of scribes as a literate group. However, when mentioning the scribal writings, they seem to distinguish the professional groups of priests, prophets, and sages from the scribal group. For instance, they, by and large, isolate a group of scribes from a group of sages and are likely to see the 'scribes' not as genuine authors of the wisdom corpus, but as the official administrators, clerks, or a subordinated group of sages.<sup>625</sup> Leo Perdue notes:

*The scribes and sages of Israel and Judah comprised a professional social class of intellectuals, composers, officials, and clerks from their origins in the monarchic period until the emergence of Rabbinic Judaism during the early centuries of the Common Era ... As writers, the sages also composed a number of texts that have survived as canonical and deuterocanonical literature, including Proverbs, Job, the Wisdom Psalms, Qoheleth, Ben Sira, and the Wisdom of Solomon. As officials and clerks the scribes participated in the administration of courts and temples that were central to the socio-religious lives of ancient Israel and early Judah. ...the sages and scribes were responsible for the editing of canonical and non-canonical literature and likely served as archivists preserving texts in libraries.*<sup>626</sup>

---

<sup>624</sup> The original version was first published in 1906 and reprinted in 1925 and 1963. See Hermann Gunkel, *Die Israelitische Literatur* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963). The English translation offered here is quoted from "The Literature of Ancient Israel by Hermann Gunkel: Introduced and Translated by Armin Siedlecki," in *Relating to the Text Interdisciplinary and Form-Critical Insights on the Bible*, ed. Timothy J. Sandoval, Carleen Mandolfo, and Martin J. Buss, JSOT 384 (London; NY: T&T Clark, 2003), 30.

<sup>625</sup> Concerning the social group of sages in ancient Israel and in the ancient world, refer to John G. Gammie and Leo G. Perdue, eds., *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990); Perdue, *Sword*; Leo G. Perdue, ed., *Scribes, Sages, and Seers: The Sage in the Eastern Mediterranean World*, FRLANT Heft. 219 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008); Blenkinsopp deals with the three primary social groups of Israel; sage, priest, and prophet. See Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Sage, Priest, Prophet: Religious and Intellectual Leadership in Ancient Israel*, LAI (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1995).

<sup>626</sup> Leo G. Perdue, "Sages, Scribes, and Seers in Israel and the Ancient Near East: An Introduction," in *Scribes, Sages, and Seers*, ed. Leo G. Perdue, FRLANT Heft. 219 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008), 3.

Put differently, although biblical materials are marked as ‘scribal’, interpreters are highly likely to treat them in the intellectual background of the model in which prophets, priests, and sages consist of different groups. Such a paradigm of three separate groups of biblical authors is influential, but this has to be challenged.

For instance, let us consider a famous Egyptian text, the *Instruction of Amenemope*, whose author, as the text claims, is considered as ‘a resident of Akhmin named *Amenemope*’. From internal evidence of formal titles and described jobs in *Amenemope*, we might regard the author as a priest, a scribe, or an overseer.<sup>627</sup> However, we could normally classify it as wisdom literature or as instruction literature by a group of ‘wise men’, and we usually classify it neither as a priestly document which reflects the specialised priestly context nor as an overseer document which speaks of the overseer’s context. The same distinction can be made in Israelite literature. Even if Job may be portrayed as offering sacrifices for his children and friends prominently, we do not call the book of Job a priestly document, nor the author a priestly writer. In the same way, the literary features in the book appearing as ‘sages’ does not demonstrate that the author of the book was a sage, nor that Job was a sage.<sup>628</sup> The significant point in understanding the social context is that the designations such as ‘sages’, ‘prophets’, and ‘priests’ are not descriptions of the authors’ professions as presented in texts. A literate person, who was not a Levite, would be interested in the priestly content and context, and could have written the book of Leviticus. Even so, it would not be necessary for him to be a priest, in order to write the priestly document. In the same way, there is no reason why a writer should be a prophet—though there might be prophets who could write their oracles by themselves—in order to write specified books of a prophetic genre, and why a writer should be a sage, in order to write texts which belong to wisdom instruction or collections of proverbs.

---

<sup>627</sup> James Roger Black, “The Instruction of Amenemope: A Critical Edition and Commentary Prolegomenon and Prologue” (PhD, The University of Wisconsin, 2002), 274–80.

<sup>628</sup> Terrien, “Job as a Sage.”

However, this does not imply that the historical context of priests, prophets, and sages, who appear in ancient Israel, should be dismissed. The approach of form-criticism has provided us with the original setting of the biblical world which is useful in tracing the life and thought of the Israelites. However, that may not say that writers of wisdom books were necessarily different from those of prophetic literature. If we accept that all the literate élite in the late period belonged to a circle of scribes and that they were involved to a significant extent in producing biblical literature as a valid inference, there would be no reason for us not to accept that all the biblical writers, including groups of priests, prophets, and possibly sages, could belong to the circle of scribes.

#### 4.5.4 Summary

The common belief, that the wisdom and prophetic books were produced by sages and prophets, has a limit, though it should not be totally dismissed. Form criticism, which is influential in the development of the two separate groups, goes in a particular direction to create the specific social setting. The supposition is that the composition and tradition of prophetic book were shaped by prophets, and the wisdom literature and tradition were fashioned by sages. Different professional groups are engaged with specific literary types, and this is what scholars generally deduce from the literary genre of form-criticism. This, however, does not mean that there is no connection with the historical phenomenon of ‘prophecy’, and there might plausibly be a literary ‘wisdom’ movement in the early monarchy period; although whether there was a wisdom movement in the monarchy period cannot be easily determined.<sup>629</sup> Also, there were a

---

<sup>629</sup> Donn F. Morgan, *Wisdom in the Old Testament Traditions* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1981), 142–6 proposes several different kinds of the nature of “wisdom” using the interrelationship between other literary traditions and its literary patterns: (1) the “popular wisdom” in the form of proverbs, parables, and riddles, and the “clan/family wisdom” concerning the law or legal practices derived in the pre-monarchical period; (2) the “clan wisdom” in the early monarchical period which is characterized by “monarchical institutions”, including Genesis 2-3 (4-11), the “Joseph story”, the “succession narrative”, “Solomon’s wisdom”, “Moses birth narrative”, and the “Song of Moses”; (3) the “prophetic wisdom” before and after the exilic period. He then emphasises that the Israelite wisdom tradition, as a literary movement reflecting on the wisdom corpus of the Hebrew Bible, was begun in the early years of

significant amount of prophetic oracles in earlier forms which could be written by prophets who performed the act of prophecy, while a group of sages could possibly exist in the late pre-exilic period and might be involved in writing the earliest collections of wisdom books. Nevertheless, both the wisdom and prophetic traditions lack something to reflect the real life of ancient Israelites which the correspondent texts describe. Even if wisdom corpus such as Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Song of Songs is likely to have verses attributed to King Solomon, those books are not dated to the early monarchy<sup>630</sup> and they are usually regarded as coming into being in the later period. Though there are the earliest forms of prophetic oracles, the prophetic books may have been regarded as products of the later redactions in the Second Temple period. If what those biblical texts present are the cumulative work of the literate experts, reflecting real-life situations which scribes were interested in, it would be pointless to exclusively apply what sages and prophets did and performed into wisdom and prophetic books.

#### 4.6 Conclusion

We need to distinguish between the surface context, as it appears at an ostensible level from text, and the context in which the intellectual literati read, wrote, and studied collections of former texts across several centuries. Understanding what scribes used and memorised in their hearts from early oral-written sources would help us to know the origin of various interconnections between different types/genres of biblical materials, and to see their particular interests reflected in biblical literature. The proposed approach of scribalism thus does not sweep away form-criticism, but makes up for its weak points, without dismissing the existing model of sages and prophets. Coming back to our concern of Job and Deutero-Isaiah, because the final form of Job and Deutero-Isaiah are generally dated to approximately the same period, the Persian period—although we cannot point to a specific date for this—it seems reasonable to

---

monarchy by a group of “wise men” and by “schools”, and afterwards was developed in the prophetic movement.

<sup>630</sup> Carr, *Introduction*, 73–8.

suppose that the social context which the two different books share is the Jewish scribal culture in the Persian period.

## **Chapter 5 Intellectual Background of Job and Deutero-Isaiah**

Unquestionably, ancient Israel did not remain completely detached from its ancient Near Eastern milieu, because it emerged from the Palestine region close to Canaanite civilization and was geographically located between the ancient Egyptian and Mesopotamian civilizations which had already produced a variety of ancient literatures for more than a thousand years before the history of Israel. Accordingly, it is necessary to explore and appreciate the possible connections with ancient Near Eastern texts. Having carried out possible associations with non-Israelite literatures, biblical scholarship has maintained that foreign influences have impacted on the formation of biblical materials and that biblical writers used specific extra-biblical sources. This tendency is found in the literary relationship between Job/Deutero-Isaiah and foreign texts. Scholars have appreciated the direct dependence as an alternative way of explaining similarities, or some have addressed the literary influence from a specific ancient civilization, based on the belief that biblical materials did not arise from a vacuum. This, in fact, may complicate our inquiry into the intellectual environment of scribes.

If that is the case, how should we understand the literary links between foreign compositions and Job/Deutero-Isaiah? We may postulate three different ways. A first possibility is that biblical writers directly knew and depended on specific foreign texts. The author of Job referred to lawsuit, theodicy, or pessimistic texts, while Deutero-Isaiah knew Neo-Babylonian royal inscriptions or Neo-Assyrian prophetic oracles. That would give an alternative explanation for the resemblances between Job/Deutero-Isaiah and non-Israelite texts, but this explanation does not necessarily require any broad background of scribal culture which we have looked at. A second possibility is that both of them emerged from a common cultural influence and their authors picked up interesting ideas from a widespread intellectual background. This possibility is similar to the first, since foreign compositions with texts which also appear in the Hebrew Bible must be related. However, the difference is that resemblances may result from combinations of broad religious and societal ideas, rather than from the use of specific non-

Israelite references. In this case it is not important whether the biblical authors have prior individual knowledge about the earlier works which are regarded as similar with each book. A third possibility is that neither of the books is significantly related to the influence of foreign literature. In that case, all the literary features of the two books may be understood in terms of a Israelite culture which is distinct from other cultural milieux.

Among these possibilities, the third option would fail to acknowledge the significance of the considerable interrelationship between Israelite and foreign culture. It would be difficult to exclude the influence of extra-biblical materials at all, although it is true that the degree of relationship with foreign materials should be observed with caution. With regard to the first possibility, when we consider that scribes were quite likely employed in many walks of life and in various diaspora communities, there is little evidence that Judean/Jewish scribes had no knowledge of foreign languages, or did not actually read some of the ancient Near Eastern literature. However, it would be also misleading to imagine that when producing Israelite writings, scribes from their archives could have easily referred to all the Egyptian, Ugaritic, and Akkadian sources. These two extremes, in fact, could not prove anything in terms of the influence of scribal culture which appears in common between biblical literatures. If considering that scribes generally were surrounded by a varied oral-written literary culture, the second option would be more realistic than those two extremes. I thus support the claim that these resemblances with non-Israelite sources may be understood as cultural knowledge and common literary techniques which scribes possessed and practised. These are issues and arguments which I will explore, when discussing the ancient Near Eastern compositions which are supposed to have similarities with the two books.

### 5.1 *Literary Dependence of Job on Foreign Literature*

Most commentators on the book of Job have noticed its broad association with non-Israelite materials, although they differ in the degree of similarity discerned and in its interpretation.<sup>631</sup>

Among a considerable number of texts in foreign literature, the following are the most frequently cited texts.

#### 5.1.1 Sumerian Literature

It is taken for granted that the book of Job has literary parallels with ancient Mesopotamian documents which go back as far as Sumerian work. Particular attention has been given to the Sumerian *Man and His God* which is well-known as having Job's motif of a man who seems to be given an undeserved punishment from his deity.<sup>632</sup> All five pieces of this manuscript were excavated at Nippur and are possibly dated to 1700 BCE.<sup>633</sup> Since S. N. Kramer, in his earliest paper, put a subtitle 'a Sumerian variation of the Job motif' upon this text,<sup>634</sup> most interpreters have treated this document as the earliest work which parallels the book of Job. This remarkable work takes the poetic genre of lamentation and deals with the theme of suffering and comfort. A young man who suffered sickness, but did not commit any evil and deceit is introduced by the poet (ANET, lines 10-20). He, finally, confesses his sins before a deity and in the lament, recognising his sins with wailing, he humbly pleads with his god for restoration and

---

<sup>631</sup> Refer to Dhorme, *Job*, cx–cxi; Gordis, *Man*, 53–64; Hartley, *Job*, 6–11; Terrien, *Job*, 56–62; Balentine, *Job*, 5–12; Gray, *Job*, 5–20; "Book of Job in the Context of Near Eastern Literature," *ZAW* 82, no. 2 (1970): 251–69; James L. Crenshaw, *Reading Job: A Literary and Theological Commentary* (Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys Publication, 2011), 7–10; Tremper Longman III, *Job*, Baker Commentary on the Old Testament Wisdom and Psalms (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012), 45–51; Seow, *Job*, 47–65.

<sup>632</sup> James Bennett Pritchard, ed., *ANET*, 3rd ed. with supplement. (Princeton: Princeton, 1969), 589–91; William W. Hallo, ed., *The Context of Scripture*, vol. I (Leiden; NY; Köln: Brill, 1997), 573–5.

<sup>633</sup> "The date of the original composition of the poem may have been as early as the Third Dynasty of Ur, about 2000 B.C." See S. N. Kramer, "'Man and His God': A Sumerian Variation on 'Job' Motif," in *Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East: Presented to Professor Harold Henry Rowley*, ed. Martin Noth and David Winton Thomas, SVT 3 (Leiden: Brill, 1955), 170.

<sup>634</sup> Kramer, "'Job' Motif."



forgiveness (lines 117-120). Although this man in the beginning of the text does not seem to break any of god's rules, the cause of his suffering is finally placed on the man:

*My god, now that you have shown me my sins ...,  
In the gate of ..., I would speak ...,  
I, the young man, would confess my sins before you. (lines 111-3)*

Finally, the god accepts his supplication and withdraws his hand upon him, and this leads him to glorify his god and to turn lament into joy. Clearly, the prayer and the petition of the man led his personal god to grant the compassion and joy that human reaction induces. This supports the conventional belief that the sinless man does not exist.<sup>635</sup> However, this is nothing more than the typical lesson of inescapable human suffering and sin, and the book of Job is unlikely to produce distinct affinities with this composition.

### 5.1.2 Babylonian Literature

The literary motif of human misfortune and suffering indicated in Sumerian *Man and His God* has its counterparts in Babylonian literature in the same way; there are four Babylonian texts which are associated with Job.

#### 5.1.2.1 *Dialogue between a Man and His God*

After Jean Nougayrol at first edited this fragment “Une version du ‘Juste Souffrant’” (Tablet AO 4462)—which is generally dated to the late Old Babylonian period (late 17<sup>th</sup> century BCE)—it has been frequently entitled the poem of the ‘Just Sufferer’ or the *Dialogue between a Man and His God* (abb., *Man and His God*).<sup>636</sup> This foreign text has been compared to the book of Job, in that its framework is similar to Job's prose-tale; it begins with the pleading of a person in agony and ends with the description of the restoration of his prosperity and health. W.

---

<sup>635</sup> Jacob Klein refers to verses from biblical literature (cf. Job 4:17-18; 7:20-21; 15:17-18; Gen 6:5-7; Ps 51:7), but this merely reaffirms it was a prevalent idea. See *COS I*, I:574.

<sup>636</sup> Jean Nougayrol, “Une Version Ancienne Du ‘Juste Souffrant,’” *RB* 59, no. 2 (1952): 239–50; Benjamin R. Foster, *BM*, 3rd ed. (Bethesda, MD: CDL, 2005), 148–50; Hallo, *COS I*, I:485.

von Soden maintains that this is the earliest cuneiform text which includes Job's motif of accusing his deity.<sup>637</sup> In terms of this affinity, John Gray compares specific expressions between Job and *Man and His God*, and remarks that both state the motif of the sufferer's innocence; (1) the role of god or friends in Job 6:14ff and the expression, 'Brother does not despise his brother, Friend is not calumniator of his friend' (BM, lines 14-15); (2) the divine vindication and declaration in Job 42:7 and lines 48-57.<sup>638</sup> The structure of this cuneiform document consists of a short dialogue between the sufferer, who mourns his loss, and his personal god.

#### 5.1.2.2 *The Babylonian Job*

The text, *Ludlul bēl nēmeqi*, 'I will Praise the Lord of Wisdom' (abb., *Ludlul*)—which is also known as 'The Babylonian Job', or 'The Poem of the Righteous Sufferer'—is another composition which is compared to Job.<sup>639</sup> This Akkadian poem consists of four tablets (approximately 500 lines) known from the libraries of *Ashurbanipal* at *Nineveh* in the seventh century BCE, and its original text probably can be dated to the fifteenth century BCE, as three kings are named who lived in the Kassite period (1550-1155 BCE), although this is somewhat doubtful.<sup>640</sup> It takes the form of a monologue addressed by a dignified man, Shubshi-meshre-Shakkan, who is struck by illness and calamity, asking why the gods allow him to suffer, and finally whose health and good fortune are reinstated by Marduk. The first tablet opens with a hymn of praise to Marduk the god of wisdom (Tablet I, lines 1-39) and immediately the man wails that his gods forsook him, and he became regarded as a social pariah by his friends, slaves,

---

<sup>637</sup> W. von Soden, "Das Fragen Nach Der Gerechtigkeit Gottes Im Alten Orient," *MDOG* 96 (1965): 41–59.

<sup>638</sup> Gray, "Near," 259.

<sup>639</sup> I use the translated text by Benjamin Foster. See Foster, *BM*, 392–409; For other versions, see W. G. Lambert, *BWL* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960), 21–62; Pritchard, *ANET*, 434–7, 596–600; Hallo, *COS* I, 1:486–92; For a new edition, see Amar Annus and Alan Lenzi, *Ludlul Bēl Nēmeqi: The Standard Babylonian Poem of the Righteous Sufferer*, SAACT 7 (Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 2010).

<sup>640</sup> Gray, "Near," 254; Lambert, *BWL*, 26.

and families (Tablet I, lines 41-44, 79-104). In Tablet III, he laments his suffering under the oppression of the almighty Marduk:

*Heavy was his hand upon me, I could not bear it!  
Dread of him was oppressive, it [ me]. (Tablet III, lines 1-2)*

He dreams three times and in the third dream, the sufferer meets two messengers sent from Marduk who orders his deliverance (III, 29-38). By this sign, he is assured that his prayers are accepted, so that his pain is ended and his illness is cured. In the healing process, his transgressions are forgiven and Marduk's wrath seems to be appeased by his petition (III, 51-59). Tablet IV lines 1'-50' begins with the hymn of Shubshi-meshre-Shakkan in praise of the wondrous work of Marduk as a saviour and as a mighty warrior who defeated his enemies and is returning to the 'Gate of Sunrise' from the grave. Then, this sufferer spells out how ungrudgingly he offered offerings with prayers. Finally, in the Babylonian feast, they look at the power of Marduk who is able to restore human well-being and bring the dead to life (IV, fragment C 11')

Scholars see *Ludlul* as having closer verbal correspondences with the book of Job than any other work of foreign literature, so that this has been treated as the source text of Job.<sup>641</sup> However, because of the prevalent literary features, it is also argued that both texts reflect a common literary tradition that existed in Mesopotamia and Israel. For instance, Gray proposes that the sufferer, like Job, is portrayed as being punished under divine oppression in Job 19:13-17 and Tablet I lines 82-92, and then claims that Job (also texts in the Psalms) and the Mesopotamian theodicy compositions including the *Babylonian Theodicy* 'reflect the conventional language of the Complaint of the Sufferer in fast-liturgies in Mesopotamia and Israel'.<sup>642</sup> C. L. Seow sees the genre of the hymn as the common source where sufferers praise

---

<sup>641</sup> Dhorme, *Job*, lxxxvi; Weinfeld for instance, points out the similarity between the pattern of *Ludlul* and Elihu's speech in Job 33. Moshe Weinfeld, "Job and Its Mesopotamian Parallels - A Typological Analysis," in *Text and Context* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1988), 218.

<sup>642</sup> See Gray, "Near," 255. Gray in another place notices that Job's text would be developed in the Israelite literary tradition of the "Plaint of the Sufferer" from Ps 73. See 261.

their deities in their hardship for the sake of the gods' beneficence: According to Seow, the affinities in expressions between Eliphaz's hymn in Job 5:18-20, *Ludlul*, and 'a Sufferer's Salvation' (RS 25.460)<sup>643</sup>—the Akkadian hymn praising Marduk—are 'suggestive' of this and he concludes that the source of the similarity is the genre of the hymn like in Eliphaz's hymn and in other Akkadian 'exemplary-sufferer texts'.<sup>644</sup>

### 5.1.2.3 *The Babylonian Theodicy*

*The Babylonian Theodicy* (abb., BT) called the 'Babylonian Ecclesiastes', 'the dialogue about human misery', and 'the sufferer and the friend' is another composition which to some degree resembles Job.<sup>645</sup> The possible date of the tablets is not earlier than 800 BCE, while its general style falls into the Kassite period.<sup>646</sup> This work uses the form of an acrostic dialogue which consists of twenty-seven stanzas of eleven lines each between a sufferer and his unnamed friend. Because of the literary form of dialogue, this work is considered as the composition most similar to the dialogue in the book of Job.<sup>647</sup> The poet's name in acrostic is recorded as: 'I, Saggil-kīnam-ubbib, the incantation priest, am adorant of the god and the king.'<sup>648</sup> In Tablets II and IV, the point that friends make is that the pious life always results in being wealthy and leads to divine protection and favour:

*He who looks to his god has a protector  
The humble man who reveres his goddess will garner wealth. (21-22)*

---

<sup>643</sup> Nougayrol supposed that both *Ludlul* and B.S. 25.460 would probably be from the fourteenth century BCE. See Jean Nougayrol, *Ugaritica 5: Nouveaux Textes Accadiens, Hourrites et Ugaritiques Des Archives et Bibliothèques Privées d'Ugarit, Commentaires Des Textes Historiques (première Partie)*, Mission de Ras Shamra t. 16 (Paris: Geuthner, 1968), 265–73; Foster, *BM*, 410–1; Hallo, *COS I*, I:486.

<sup>644</sup> Seow, *Job*, 53–4; Weinfeld sees "Thanksgiving Psalms" as a common source. Weinfeld, "Mesopotamian."

<sup>645</sup> I use Foster's translation. Foster, *BM*, 914–22; For other versions, see Lambert, *BWL*, 63–91; Pritchard, *ANET*, 438–40, 601–4; Hallo, *COS I*, I:492–5.

<sup>646</sup> See Lambert, *BWL*, 66–7.

<sup>647</sup> See Karel van der Toorn, "The Ancient Near Eastern Literary Dialogue as a Vehicle of Critical Reflection," in *Dispute Poems and Dialogues in the Ancient and Mediaeval Near East* (Louvain: Departement Oriëntalistiek, 1991), 59–75.

<sup>648</sup> Lambert, *BWL*, 63.

On the contrary, to the sufferer, the situation which he faced as a result of the loss of his assets and health makes his life's system uncertain (III) and even the regular rites before gods are useless as both the human and animal world demonstrate (V). What the friend clings to is the mysteriousness of the divine purpose and the sure belief of rewards granted by a personal god (VI). The sufferer in BT like Job is terribly distressed by the general collapse of religious and social justice and by his unfair treatment by his personal god (VII):

*Those who seek not after a god can go the road of favor,  
Those who pray to a goddess have grown poor and destitute. (70-1)  
Indeed, in my youth I tried to find out the will of (my) god,  
With prayer and supplication I besought my goddess.  
I bore a yoke of profitless servitude:  
(My) god decreed (for me) poverty instead of wealth. (75)*

In spite of a great deal of discussion between them, no agreement is reached as to the connection between the religious attitudes to the deities and their consequences for mankind (VII-VIII). The sufferer wants to escape the pain of everyday life (XIII) and complains that the destinies of the king and the poor cannot be exchanged (XVII). A friend claims that 'he who bears a god's yoke' will never lack food (XXII) and that human beings cannot understand the will of the god(s) (XXIV). Human suffering is caused by individual sin which is part of human nature created by the god(s) (XXVI). The sufferer indeed observes that the present miserable situation comes from a divine action (XXIII) and further he is startled when he finds social injustice and inequality (XXV). Finally, he pleads for help from a friend, urging him to think of his suffering, and ends up with his prayer to the gods (XXVII). Substantial affinities, in this way, are observed between the dialogue of Job and BT in cases of common expressions and the motif of the sufferer.<sup>649</sup>

---

<sup>649</sup> See Gray, "Near," 256–8; Weinfeld, "Mesopotamian," 222–5; Balentine and Crenshaw indicate several differences between two compositions. See Balentine, *Job*, 4–6; Crenshaw, *Reading Job*, 8–9.

#### 5.1.2.4 *A Pessimistic Dialogue between Master and Servant*

The title ‘a Pessimistic Dialogue between Master and Servant’—known as ‘the Dialogue of Pessimism’ (abb., *Pessimism*)—is occasionally compared to Job.<sup>650</sup> It would date from a comparatively early part of the Kassite period excluding the Old Babylonian period, because of the particular use of the ‘iron dagger’ (line 52).<sup>651</sup> Scholars have claimed that *Pessimism* adopts the form of Babylonian satirical dialogue, but it would probably be hard to consider the trial of suicide simply as a parody.<sup>652</sup> The master in this literature speaks to his servant of the many undertakings which he is about to carry out, but after flattering lip-service to the master’s idea, the servant outlines the negative consequences which the master’s action will bring. Then, when the master changes his plan, the servant reports equally other depressing consequences which would follow from his actions. Finally, after the master addresses all the desires and when he asks the slave what is the right thing to do, the slave answers that ultimate goodness in life is suicide and the master determines to kill his slave. This composition that talks about the futility of life has not as many similar features with the book of Job as texts examined above except for the common form of dialogue.<sup>653</sup>

#### 5.1.3 Ugaritic Literature

Modern scholarship has discovered many linguistic similarities between Ugaritic literature and the book of Job,<sup>654</sup> Job’s dependence on Ugaritic texts has been investigated as being more

---

<sup>650</sup> *BWL*, 139–49; *ANET*, 437–8; *BM*, 923–26; *COS I*, I:495–6.

<sup>651</sup> Lambert, *BWL*, 140.

<sup>652</sup> Lambert disagrees with Speiser’s view of satire and notes that “in a normal person a desire for death and an abundance of wit would be incompatible”. See *ibid.*, 139–41; E. A. Speiser, “The Case of the Obliging Servant,” *JCA* 8, no. 3 (1954): 98–105.

<sup>653</sup> Crenshaw, *Reading Job*, 10.

<sup>654</sup> For “Ugaritisms” in the book of Job, See works of Dahood and his proponents. Mitchell Joseph Dahood, “Some Northwest Semitic Words in Job,” *Biblica* 38, no. 3 (1957): 306–20; “Some Rare Parallel Word Pairs in Job and in Ugaritic,” in *Word in the World* (Massachusetts: Weston College, 1973), 19–34; Blommerde, *Northwest Semitic Grammar and Job*; Anthony R. Ceresko, *Job 29-31 in the Light of Northwest Semitic: A Translation and Philological Commentary*, BO 36 (Rome: Biblical Institute, 1980); Grabbe, *Comparative*.

original and direct.<sup>655</sup> In particular, among those Ugaritic texts, The *Epic of Keret* (abb., *Keret*)<sup>656</sup> is suggested as representative literature related to Job. This composition appears on three clay tablets discovered during the archeological digs at Ras Shamra (1930-1931 CE), and each tablet has six columns on both sides.<sup>657</sup> The colophon of this work records that its writer was a scribe Elimelek during the reign of a Ugaritic king, Niqmadd in the fourteenth century BCE (KRT C).<sup>658</sup> According to John Gibson, though this story is ideological, both Keret who was ‘the typical sacred king of ancient Near Eastern belief’ and the Udum’s king Pabil might be historical figures.<sup>659</sup>

*Keret* is the story of a king whose seven wives suddenly perished so that this king lacks an heir. In deep grief, he has a dream in which the god El appears to him and asks why Keret cries. In response to the instructions of El, Keret offers sacrifices to El and Baal, prepares provisions for a campaign, and marches his army into Udum the Great in order to find a wife who may beget his heir (KRT A, lines 154-194). He successfully takes Huray Pabul’s daughter in marriage and subsequently, in the assembly of gods, El blesses and exalts Keret with the promise of eight sons (KRT B, lines 1-28). However, the vow Keret made during the battle is not fulfilled, and illness immediately strikes him and this results in crop failure. After the ceremony held in the

---

<sup>655</sup> Charles Lee Feinberg, “The Poetic Structure of the Book of Job and the Ugaritic Literature,” *BS* 103, no. 411 (1946): 283–92; Peter C. Craigie, “Job and Ugaritic Studies,” in *Studies in the Book of Job*, ed. Walter Emanuel Aufrecht (Wilfrid Laurier UP, 1985), 28–35; Daniel O’Connor, “The Keret Legend and the Prologue-Epilogue of Job,” *ITQ* 55, no. 3 (1989): 1–6; Lowell K. Handy, “The Authorization of Divine Power and the Guilt of God in the Book of Job : Useful Ugaritic Parallels,” *JSOT*, no. 60 (1993): 107–18; Johannes C. de Moor, “Ugarit and the Origin of Job,” in *Ugarit and the Bible* (Münster: Ugarit-Vorlag, 1994), 225–57; Robert S. Fyall, *Now My Eyes Have Seen You: Images of Creation and Evil in the Book of Job* (Leicester: IVP, 2002), 191–4.

<sup>656</sup> Other vocalizations of the word “Keret” are possible; e.g. Kirta, Karrate, Kuriti, Karta. See n. 3 in Hallo, *COS I*, I:333.

<sup>657</sup> I will use Ginsberg’s version from ANET. See Pritchard, *ANET*, 142–9; John C. L. Gibson, *Canaanite Myths and Legends*, 2nd ed. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1978), 19–23, 82–102; Hallo, *COS I*, I:333–43.

<sup>658</sup> See the end of KRT C. Pritchard, *ANET*, 142.

<sup>659</sup> Gibson, *Canaanite*, 23.

temple, divine intervention miraculously cures his impaired health (KRT C, v. lines 6-32, 42-53).

Similarities with Job noted by scholars usually centre around the entire tale that describes the sudden loss of the sufferer's household, his long illness, and the restoration of his health (e.g. Job 1:13-19; 42:10-45; esp. Job 42:10).<sup>660</sup> Both Peter Craigie and Daniel O'Connor maintain that the author of the prologue-epilogue of Job consciously used this prose-tale of Keret;<sup>661</sup> O'Connor concludes that 'the true cultural homeland for the prose of Job is likely to be the stretch of coastline from Ugarit to Tyre and Sidon'.<sup>662</sup>

#### 5.1.4 Egyptian Literature

There seems to be considerable consensus on the dependence of Israelite wisdom literature on Egyptian literature;<sup>663</sup> e.g., the similarity between Prov 22:17-24:22 and *The Instruction of Amenemope*. Egyptian compositions, which are frequently mentioned in relation to the book of Job, largely date to the Middle Kingdom period (Eleventh-Fourteenth Dynasty; 1975-1630 BCE), and literary discourses in that period deal with much emphasis focused on individual agony as well as on national disasters.<sup>664</sup> The main similarity between them would probably be

---

<sup>660</sup> See O'Connor, "The Keret Legend and the Prologue-Epilogue of Job," 1-3; Victor Harold Matthews and Don C. Benjamin, *OTP* (NY: Paulist, 1991), 201-5.

<sup>661</sup> Craigie, "Job and Ugaritic Studies"; O'Connor, "The Keret Legend and the Prologue-Epilogue of Job"; Matthews and Benjamin, *OTP*, 201-5.

<sup>662</sup> O'Connor, "The Keret Legend and the Prologue-Epilogue of Job"; Parker notes that "in particular, 1.14.12-21 recalls Job 1:13-22." See Simon B. Parker, *The Pre-Biblical Narrative Tradition: Essays on the Ugaritic Poems Keret and Aqhat*, RBS 24 (Atlanta: Scholars, 1989), 145-216.

<sup>663</sup> Shupak maintains that "the Hebrew authors were closely acquainted with at least part of the Egyptian wisdom literature." See Nili Shupak, *Where Can Wisdom Be Found?: The Sage's Language in the Bible and in Ancient Egyptian Literature*, OBO 130 (Fribourg, Switzerland: Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993). Also see Glendon E. Bryce, *A Legacy of Wisdom: The Egyptian Contribution to the Wisdom of Israel* (Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, 1979).

<sup>664</sup> Richard B. Parkinson, "Individual and Society in Middle Kingdom Literature," in *Ancient Egyptian Literature: History and Forms*, ed. Antonio Loprieno, Probleme der Ägyptologie 10 (Leiden; NY: Brill, 1996), 150-1.



that human evil and world disorder are never blamed upon god, and suffering is seen as the consequence of human wrongdoings.<sup>665</sup> John Baines says:

*The relation between inequality and theodicy is stated explicitly in a Middle Kingdom apologia of the creator god, who distances himself from human wrongdoing, saying: "I made every man like his fellow. I did not ordain that they do wrong (izfet, "disorder"). It was their desires that damaged what I had said" (his creative word that brought the world into being?). ... The creator is not responsible for the origin of evil.*<sup>666</sup>

The fact that no humans are born sinless significantly explains human wrongdoings in Egyptian literature. This can be indicated in many arguments between Job and his friends (Job 4:12-21; 15:14-16; 25:4-6; cf. 9:2-3) as traditionalists who have the belief that the world is driven by moral laws.

#### 5.1.4.1 *The Debate between a Man and His Soul*

The first composition is *The Debate (or Dispute) between a Man and His Soul (Ba)* (abb., *Debate*)—also known as ‘Dialogue of a Man with His Soul’, ‘A Dispute over Suicide’, or ‘The Man Who was Tired of Life’—and its manuscript (Papyrus Berlin 3024) is dated to the Twelfth Dynasty in the Middle Kingdom and has a poetic dialogue form.<sup>667</sup> A dialogue between the tired man caused by suffering in life and his *ba* (usually translated as ‘soul’) which ‘is one aspect of the personality, and ‘the manifestation of a person after death’<sup>668</sup> expresses the conflict of a sufferer with ‘the heart that serves to personify one side of an internal

---

<sup>665</sup> See Bricker, “Innocent Suffering in Egypt,” 89–90.

<sup>666</sup> See John Baines, “Society, Morality, and Religious Practice,” in *Religion in Ancient Egypt: Gods, Myths, and Personal Practice*, ed. Byron E. Shafer (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1991), 163.

<sup>667</sup> I here use Allen’s translation. See James P. Allen, *The Debate Between a Man and His Soul: A Masterpiece of Ancient Egyptian Literature*, Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 44 (Leiden: Brill, 2010); For other English translations, see Pritchard, *ANET*, 405–7; William W. Hallo, ed., *The Context of Scripture*, vol. III (Leiden; NY; Köln: Brill, 2002), 321–6; Miriam Lichtheim, *AEL*, vol. 1 (Berkeley: University of California, 1973); For the study of this, see Richard B. Parkinson, *The Tale of Sinuhe and Other Ancient Egyptian Poems, 1940-1640 BC* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 151–65; Richard B. Parkinson, *Poetry and Culture in Middle Kingdom Egypt: A Dark Side to Perfection* (Oakville: Equinox Pub. Ltd, 2010), 163–9.

<sup>668</sup> Parkinson, *Sinuhe*, 151.

conversation'.<sup>669</sup> This work consists of three symmetrical speeches between the man and his soul, ending up with the soul's final speech. The first part of this manuscript is missing which may include the short setting of the introductory scene in the discussion between a man and his soul.<sup>670</sup> In this fictional setting, the man, suffering and overburdened, wishes to die, but his soul warns and threatens to leave him, which will finally lead to his total destruction.<sup>671</sup> The soul in the third speech interrupts the sufferer, advising him not to desire death by referring to the misery of death and challenging him to stop worrying:

*As for your bringing to mind burial, it is heartache; it is bringing tears by  
saddening a man; (56-7)  
Follow a good time, forget care. (68)*

The soul then takes the imagery of two parables: a little man who loses his wife and children (68-80), and a little man who lacks patience (80-85). Then, the man addresses him in a lengthy poetic speech (85-147) with several refrains—'Look, my name is reeking', 'to whom can I speak today?', and 'death is in my sight today'—and he in each refrain expresses the misery of life in his individual experience, his alienation from society, and death as an ultimate release from a disastrous life.<sup>672</sup> The man in the concluding lyric—'surely, he who is there will be...'—anticipates the judgment of a living god, making the contrast between the suffering in the present world 'here' and the future ideal world 'there' (140-9). Finally, the soul urges the man to continue his life and to 'reject the West for yourself', but to 'desire too that you reach the West when your body touches the earth', (151-2) and this is the final reply to him.

---

<sup>669</sup> See Allen, *Debate*, 3. The intellectual background of this literature comes with the composite dialogues in different speeches of death and life, but its main style is a monologue to represent the inner struggle. See Parkinson, *Culture*, 218.

<sup>670</sup> Parkinson, *Sinuhe*, 160.

<sup>671</sup> The total destruction means "the second and final death known from other Egyptian texts." See *ibid.*, 152.

<sup>672</sup> Parkinson, *Culture*, 221-4.

This composition, according to Parkinson, speaks of the two contrasting aspects of ‘death’ pointing to ‘its horror and its blessedness’.<sup>673</sup> Death would be welcome to the sufferer, but death to his soul may not solve all the problems, so that the soul urges him to accept the present life (151-2). When looking at the whole dialogue, we may compare this attitude to death with Job’s speeches that long for the place of *Sheol* and desire to escape life.

#### 5.1.4.2 *The Protests of the Eloquent Peasant*

The complete manuscript of *The Protests of the Eloquent Peasant* (abb., *Peasant*) is preserved on four Middle Kingdom papyrus copies (Papyrus Berlin 3023, 3025, 10499; Papyrus Butler 527 or British Museum 10274) from Thebes dating to the middle of the Twelfth or the Tenth Dynasty.<sup>674</sup> This work consists of the basic narrative of a prose-tale and of nine poems as debates before the court, resembling the structure of Job. In it, a peasant Khunanup, who was robbed by Nemtinakht, desperately appeals to Rensi, the High Steward, the son of Meru, who was a deputy to the king. In spite of the continuous rejections from Rensi, the peasant, in order to appease his bitterness, does not stop pleading his case and urging social justice to the magistrate, and finally, he wishes for death as a place where genuine justice is fulfilled. In his personal petition, the creator-god Maat is eulogized and the poet addresses the imperfect world in the absence of Maat:<sup>675</sup>

*Making defects lessens Truth:  
So measure well!  
For Truth has not been damaged, nor has overflown. (BI 282-3)*

In the discourse, the distinction between Rensi and Maat is somewhat ambiguous and Rensi is then honoured as a god’s representative.<sup>676</sup> The peasant laments:

---

<sup>673</sup> Richard B. Parkinson, *Voices from Ancient Egypt: An Anthology of Middle Kingdom Writings* (London: British Museum, 1991), 132.

<sup>674</sup> I use Parkinson’s translation. See Parkinson, *Sinuhe*, 54–88; Pritchard, *ANET*, 407–10; Lichtheim, *AEL I*, 1:169–84; Hallo, *COS I*, I:98–104.

<sup>675</sup> See Parkinson, *Culture*, 169.

<sup>676</sup> *Ibid.*, 171.

*Has Truth (Maat) not addressed him (Rensi)? (B1 307)*

At the end of the tale, Rensi breaks his silence and orders that the peasant returns to the court and presents his case to the king Nebkaure as well as to the public (B2 129). According to the judgment of the Pharaoh, Nemtinakht is immediately summoned, judged in front of the court and all the stolen properties are immediately returned to the peasant. Though the tension between the despairing speeches of the peasant and the silence of the magistrate is consequently resolved as the peasant receives rewards, the tale ends without any mention of the punishment meted out to Nemtinakht for his wrongdoings and any vindication for the indifference of corrupted authority. Balentine suggests probable connections between *Peasant* and Job in terms of the request for social justice addressed to God (esp. Job 21:7-26; 24:1-25; 30:9-15).<sup>677</sup>

*5.1.4.3 The Dialogue of Ipuur and the Lord to the Limit*

‘The Admonitions of Ipuur’ or ‘the dialogue of Ipuur and the Lord to the Limit’ (abb., *Ipuur*) which is known as a work related to Job is preserved on the fragment (Papyrus Leiden 344) dating from the Nineteenth or Twentieth Dynasty; the original composition possibly belongs to the early thirteenth Dynasty.<sup>678</sup> This composition has conventionally been classified as ‘Egyptian Oracles and Prophecies’;<sup>679</sup> there is no need to categorise it as ‘prophetic’ genre because this has more similarities with the biblical wisdom corpus and has no prophetic words and indeed the role of the main addresser is far from that of a prophet. In this discourse, Ipuur is standing before people, maybe in a royal court, and is addressing ‘the Lord to the Limit’ who would be a king as a divine representative rather than a god (16.11-17.2).<sup>680</sup> The basic theme is a pessimistic lament about the wretched status of the land, and it is not referring to any real

---

<sup>677</sup> See Balentine, *Job*, 6–8.

<sup>678</sup> Pritchard, *ANET*, 441–4; Lichtheim, *AEL I*, 1:149–63; Parkinson, *Sinuhe*, 166–99; Hallo, *COS I*, I:93–8.

<sup>679</sup> COS classifies four works—*Ipuur*, *Peasant*, *Neferti*, *Khakheperreseneb*—into prophecy genre, and ANET place two works—*Ipuur*, *Neferti*—into Egyptian oracle.

<sup>680</sup> I use Parkinson’s translation. See Parkinson, *Sinuhe*.

historical disasters, although the text's setting is likely to reflect national calamities of the time.<sup>681</sup> Like the speeches of Job, Ipuur disapproves of the king as the deputy of the creator-god who brings all the disasters and chaos (1.1-14.5):

*There is no Pilot in their hour of duty—where is He today?  
So can He be sleeping? Look, no sign of His power can be seen (12.5)*

Then he expresses with a parable the unfairness of innocent suffering against the Lord's reply (15.3-16.5).

### 5.1.5 Evaluation: Job's Reference to Foreign Literature

Having considered these different sources, we are better able to assess whether the book of Job has any literary relationships with foreign texts. Firstly, there is little evidence to substantiate the claim that the author of Job was aware of specific non-Israelite counterparts and adopted them into texts. Recent biblical scholarship seems to be very cautious in speaking of direct dependence on non-Israelite sources. Some, when giving an example, would point to affinities with the tale in *The Epic of Keret* and would assume direct connection between them. However, because such a motif and general linguistic affinities are very prevalent and conventional in Ugaritic, Mesopotamian, and Egyptian materials, there is no reason to consider a specific composition as the original source of Job. For instance, Job's wailing in Job 3 in which he curses his birth and prefers to die could be considered as deriving its origin in expressions from specific Egyptian texts such as *The Dialogue of Ipuur* and *The Dialogue of a Man with His Soul*.<sup>682</sup> However, these references are not unique, since the most striking parallel is also found in the biblical texts like Jer 20:14-18.<sup>683</sup> It is thus reasonable to conclude that the common expressions in the cursing in Job 3 were prevalent among scribes.

---

<sup>681</sup> Lichtheim, *AEL I*, 1:149–50.

<sup>682</sup> See Georg Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob*, 1. Aufl., KAT Bd. 16 (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus G. Mohn, 1963), 116; Shupak notices the literary echo between the Dialogue of a Man with His Soul, Ipuur and Job's texts (cf. 3:3ff., 20-22; 10:18-19; 13:15; 14:13; 17:13-14). See Hallo, *COS I*, 1:95.

<sup>683</sup> See Clines, *Job 1-20*, 83.

Secondly, it is not always correct to say that they referred to the older and already established literary tradition of a particular ancient civilization; although it is almost certain that wisdom literature probably was more heavily influenced by the literary traditions of foreign texts than biblical books. Moshe Weinfeld argues that Mesopotamian parallels with the book of Job remind us of several psalms of Thanksgiving in biblical literature and that those similarities reflect common ‘liturgies of thanksgiving of the sufferer to his god’.<sup>684</sup> Literary resemblances between the texts of Job/Psalms and the two Mesopotamian compositions—*Man and His God* and *Ludlul*—are suggested as important evidence of literary dependence; e.g., ‘the descriptions of God’s saving of the sick and afflicted’ in Job 33:18 and the description in ‘the river Hubur of *Ludlul*’.<sup>685</sup> Weinfeld concludes that the Babylonian literary tradition produced ‘typological affinities’ with the book of Job.<sup>686</sup> Similarly, Gray claims that the book of Job adopted the literary tradition common to Mesopotamia and Israel (cf. Ps 73).<sup>687</sup> In a broad sense, it is true that Mesopotamian texts like *Ludlul* show significant resemblances with Job, but substantial references with Egyptian texts make it too difficult for us to suppose that the author of Job directly utilised only the Babylonian literary tradition.

## 5.2 *Literary Dependence of Deutero-Isaiah on Foreign Literature*

This section discusses the foreign texts which are compared to, or might have influenced, the texts of Deutero-Isaiah.

---

<sup>684</sup> Weinfeld, “Mesopotamian,” 217.

<sup>685</sup> *Ibid.*, 218.

<sup>686</sup> *Ibid.*, 222–5.

<sup>687</sup> “The anticipated relief suggests again the theme of his suffering, and here the language is reminiscent of Job and the Plaint of the Sufferer in the Psalms.” (p. 263) “The affinities of the Book of Job with the sophisticated sapiential tradition of Mesopotamia are not to be denied.” (p. 265) See Gray, “Near.”

### 5.2.1 Babylonian Inscriptions<sup>688</sup>

It has been by and large claimed that the language of Deutero-Isaiah was influenced by the style and pattern of ‘Babylonian royal inscriptions’;<sup>689</sup> based on this argument, it is widely recognised that the anonymous writer Deutero-Isaiah might have lived in Babylon during the exile. R. Kittel at first claimed that Deutero-Isaiah might know the work of the Cyrus Cylinder,<sup>690</sup> and Jacob Behr similarly argued that ‘Deutero-Isaiah’s writings are the product of a Babylonian cultural environment’ and the influences ‘were direct and immediate rather than indirect and remote’.<sup>691</sup> In the same vein, a detailed examination of this theory by Shalom Paul<sup>692</sup> attempted to show the literary influence with cuneiform texts, and took into consideration the motifs of ‘predestination’ and the ‘designation of the king’s legitimacy by a divine call’ stemming from the Sumerian period;<sup>693</sup> with similarities such as receiving a divine task (Isa 42:6-7), opening one’s eyes (49:9), and describing the designation of seven kings.<sup>694</sup> A more detailed study of Babylonian influence on Deutero-Isaiah was carried out by Stephen Peterson, arguing that Deutero-Isaiah would have been aware of Babylonian court style from royal documents.<sup>695</sup> Then, he introduces parallels between Babylonian hymns (esp. *Enuma Elish*) and the texts of Deutero-Isaiah (Isa 40:3-5; 40:12-16; 41:9ff; 41:22ff; 43:10-11, 13;

---

<sup>688</sup> Babylonian inscriptions here mainly refer to materials which correspond to the Neo-Babylonian period (1000-539 BCE).

<sup>689</sup> David Stephen Vanderhooft, *The Neo-Babylonian Empire and Babylon in the Latter Prophets*, HSM 59 (Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1999); Shalom M. Paul, “Deutero-Isaiah and Cuneiform Royal Inscriptions,” in *Essays in Memory of E. A. Speiser* (New Haven, Conn: AOS, 1968), 180–86; Jacob William Behr, *The Writings of Deutero-Isaiah and the Neo-Babylonian Royal Inscriptions: A Comparison of the Language and Style*, PUP III (Pretoria, South Africa: B. Rubinstein & Company, 1937); Stephen Lee Peterson, “Babylonian Literary Influence in Deutero-Isaiah: A Bibliographic and Critical Study” (PhD, Vanderbilt University, 1975); Nahum M. Waldman, “A Biblical Echo of Mesopotamian Royal Rhetoric,” in *Essays on the Occasion of the Seventieth Anniversary of the Dropsie University* (Philadelphia: Dropsie University, 1979), 449–55. Merrill does not support the literary dependence on specific Babylonian texts; Eugene H. Merrill, “The Language and Literary Characteristics of Isaiah 40-55 as Anti-Babylonian Polemic” (PhD, Columbia University, 1984).

<sup>690</sup> R. Kittel, “Cyrus Und Deuterjesaja,” *ZAW* 18, no. 1 (1898): 149–62.

<sup>691</sup> Behr, *Neo-Babylonian*, 30–1.

<sup>692</sup> Paul, “Cuneiform”; *Isaiah 40-66*, 61–3.

<sup>693</sup> Paul, “Cuneiform,” 181.

<sup>694</sup> *Ibid.*, 181–6.

<sup>695</sup> Peterson, “Babylonian,” 75.

44:24; 52:7) into the discussion, and indicates two common similar forms of ‘self-predication form’ and ‘the hymn of self-praise’.<sup>696</sup> These analogies, according to Peterson, indicate that Deutero-Isaiah was probably aware of Babylonian mythologies and liturgies. Moreover, it has recently been argued by David Vanderhooft that Mesopotamian royal inscriptions directly shaped Deutero-Isaiah’s thinking and that Deutero-Isaiah used Babylonian practices and ideas in his literary framework to contrast the living God of Israel with the futility of the Mesopotamian deities.<sup>697</sup> In this assumption, he explains three passages giving ‘satirical descriptions of the Babylonians’ construction and worship of divine images’ (Isa 46:1-2; 47; 48:18-20) which are not evident in any other prophetic texts in the Old Testament.<sup>698</sup> The following summarises the suggested literary influence of Babylonian texts on Deutero-Isaiah.

#### 5.2.1.1 *The Cyrus Cylinder*

The most frequently discussed text about the Babylonian influence on Deutero-Isaiah is the Cyrus Cylinder (British Museum 90920) issued by Cyrus the Great of the Persian Empire.<sup>699</sup> The fact that Nabonidus, the last king of Babylon, is portrayed as the evil king and Cyrus as the conqueror summoned by the god Marduk may imply that this was used for propaganda by Cyrus the Great in the rise of Persia and the fall of Neo-Babylon. The role of Cyrus as the great king in restoring the mistreated cultic function in the nation and liberating imprisoned Babylonians could then be used by biblical writers (Ezra 1:2-4; 6:2-5).<sup>700</sup> Lexical and thematic similarities between the Cyrus Cylinder and Deutero-Isaiah were proposed by many scholars during the past century (Kittel, Haller, Greßmann, Behr, Paul, Stephen, etc). For instance, Kittel paid attention to the linguistic analogy between Isa 44:28-45:3 and lines 12, 22, and then argued two possibilities: that Deutero-Isaiah knew the Cyrus Cylinder or that the writer of the Cyrus

---

<sup>696</sup> See *ibid.*, 78–134.

<sup>697</sup> Vanderhooft, *Neo-Babylonian*, 169–88.

<sup>698</sup> See *ibid.*, 171.

<sup>699</sup> William W. Hallo, ed., *The Context of Scripture*, vol. II (Leiden; NY; Köln: Brill, 2000), 314.

<sup>700</sup> Amélie Kuhrt, “The Cyrus Cylinder and Achaemenid Imperial Policy,” *JSOT*, no. 25 (1983): 83–4.



Cylinder was aware of Deutero-Isaiah.<sup>701</sup> The fact that Deutero-Isaiah puts the emphasis on Cyrus as an important political and religious figure may leave the possibility of literary link between them. However, such a claim has been challenged because of similar patterns widespread in other Mesopotamian royal inscriptions;<sup>702</sup> even Kittel has acknowledged the possibility of a well-known literary tradition like the ‘Babylonian court style’.<sup>703</sup>

#### 5.2.1.2 *Babylonian Royal Inscriptions*

The influence of Neo-Babylonian literature on Deutero-Isaiah can be extended to include all the Mesopotamian royal inscriptions in general. Behr finds parallels in the inscriptions of the kings—Nebuchadnezzar and Nabonidus. Shalom, unlike former researchers, takes more extensive examples, not limited to the Neo-Babylonian period. According to Paul, the motif of the king’s designation by ‘divine call’ plays an important role in comparing the language in the cuneiform with Deutero-Isaiah; ‘I have called you by name’ (Isa 43:1); ‘he designated my name’ (49:1); ‘my beloved’ (41:8); ‘my chosen one whom I desire’ (42:1); ‘shepherd’, ‘servant’ (44:28); ‘to open blind eyes, to liberate prisoners from confinement, (and) dwellers in darkness from prison’ (42:7);<sup>704</sup> see this example:<sup>705</sup>

*Šú-um- šú ki-ni-iš iz-ku-ru ‘they favorably designated his name’ (Nabonidus)*  
*zi-kir šumi-ia ke-niš im-bu-ú ‘they favorably called my name’ (Esarhaddon)*  
*‘I, Yahweh, have graciously called you’ (Isa 42:6a)*

This motif is widely spread throughout royal inscriptions during the Assyrian and late Neo-Babylonian period. Shalom furthermore presents the king’s list in royal inscriptions that shows the motif of ‘the divine predestination’: Aššur-rēš-iši I (1130-1113 BCE), Sennacherib (705-681 BCE), Esarhaddon (681-669 BCE), Aššurbanipal (669-632? BCE), Šamaššumukin (652-648 BCE),

---

<sup>701</sup> See Kittel, “Cyrus.”

<sup>702</sup> See Behr, *Neo-Babylonian*, 19.

<sup>703</sup> Kittel, “Cyrus,” 160.

<sup>704</sup> Paul, “Cuneiform,” 181–2.

<sup>705</sup> *Ibid.*, 182.

Nebuchadnezzar (605-562 BCE), and Nabonidus (556-539 BCE).<sup>706</sup> He points out that concerning the subject-matter of predestination, Deutero-Isaiah (Isa 49: 1, 5; cf. 42:6; 49:5-6; 49:8) may use either the inner-biblical reference of Jeremiah (Jer 1:5), or royal inscriptions.<sup>707</sup>

### 5.2.2 Assyrian Prophetic Oracles

The Neo-Assyrian archival corpus has not been well-known to the majority of biblical scholars, while a number of Assyriologists made efforts to publish it at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>708</sup> Though this corpus had received little attention until the 1970s,<sup>709</sup> interest in Assyrian religion and culture, however, has been increasingly promoted by scholars such as Martti Nissinen, Herbert Huffmon, Manfred Weippert, and Simo Parpola. Generally speaking, the Neo-Assyrian sources fall into two major corpuses: the twenty-nine individual oracles and reports written in the eleven tablets addressed to the Assyrian kings<sup>710</sup> and the other twenty references alluding to prophets or prophetic works.<sup>711</sup> In particular, Neo-Assyrian prophecy has been significantly compared to texts of Deutero-Isaiah;<sup>712</sup> although resemblances with Neo-

---

<sup>706</sup> Ibid., 184–5.

<sup>707</sup> However, he supposes that Jeremiah is more influential and inspirational to Deutero-Isaiah than the royal inscriptions. “The specific motif of being ‘called’ while yet in the womb is a feature which Deutero-Isaiah shares only with his Mesopotamian prototypes.” See *ibid.*, 185, n.64.

<sup>708</sup> Assyrian prophetic oracles were first introduced by George Smith in 1875 and the translated version was published by T. G. Pinches in 1878 and 1891. Then, the article ‘the Oracles Given in Favour of Esarhaddon’ published by Alphonso Delattre in 1888 at first raised its significance; most parts of the work were accessible to readers in different languages by 1915.

<sup>709</sup> See Simo Parpola, *Assyrian Prophecies*, SAA 9 (Helsinki: Helsinki UP, 1997), xiii–xiv.

<sup>710</sup> Parpola, *Assyrian*.

<sup>711</sup> Martti Nissinen, *References to Prophecy in Neo-Assyrian Sources*, State archives of Assyria studies (Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 1998); Simo Parpola, *Letters from Assyrian Scholars to the Kings Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal*, AOAT Bd. 5/1-5/2 (Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker, 1970); For the complete list, see Martti Nissinen, *Prophets and Prophecy in the Ancient Near East*, ed. Peter Machinist, WAW 12 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2003).

<sup>712</sup> For the overview of similarities between Neo-Assyrian sources and Deutero-Isaiah, see R. Russell Mack, “Neo-Assyrian Prophecy and the Hebrew Bible: A Comparative Analysis” (PhD, Hebrew Union College, 2010), 23–5; Matthijs J. de Jong, *Isaiah among the Ancient Near Eastern Prophets: A Comparative Study of the Earliest Stages of the Isaiah Tradition and the Neo-Assyrian Prophecies*, SVT 117 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 32–3; Manfred Weippert, “‘Ich Bin Jahwe’--‘Ich Bin Ištar von Arbela’: Deuterjesaja Im Lichte Der Neuassyrischen Prophetie,” in *Prophetie Und Psalmen* (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2001), 31–59.

Assyrian oracles to some extent overlap with Neo-Babylonian prophetic literature. Several scholars laid the foundation of this research. On the one hand, the possibility of direct dependence of Deutero-Isaiah on this corpus was suggested by Hugo Greßmann.<sup>713</sup> On the other hand, form critical scholars (Begrich, Westermann, Schoors, Melugin, etc) viewed the influence of Assyrio-Babylonian sources in the genre of the ‘salvation oracle’ (*Heilsorakel*).<sup>714</sup> Philip Harner claims that Deutero-Isaiah adopted the form of so-called ‘salvation oracle’ as ‘existing models of the oracle as well as other forms of prophetic speech’ from Neo-Assyrian sources.<sup>715</sup> Furthermore, Meindert Dijkstra finds similar patterns with Mesopotamian documents, and traces their *Sitz im Leben* as a cultic function.<sup>716</sup> These researches are likely to assume that Deutero-Isaiah is dependent on specific styles and genres drawn from Assyrian literature. On the contrary, Manfred Weippert supposes that this similarity comes from the adoption of the same genre ‘the king oracle’ (*het koningsorakel*),<sup>717</sup> but he thinks that this genre was not connected to the Assyrian oracles, but was developed in the old Israelite literary tradition,; e.g., Isa 45:1-7, 2 Sam 7:4-17 and 1 Sam 10:1b, 7b.<sup>718</sup> There are two Assyrian prophetic sources related to our interest.<sup>719</sup>

---

<sup>713</sup> See Hugo Greßmann, “Die Literarische Analyse Deuterojesajas,” *ZAW* 34, no. 4 (1914).

<sup>714</sup> See Schoors, *I Am God Your Saviour*, 32–275.

<sup>715</sup> Philip B. Harner, “Salvation Oracle in Second Isaiah,” *JBL* 88, no. 4 (1969): 419.

<sup>716</sup> I referred to the English summary in the book. See Meindert Dijkstra, *Gods Voorstelling: Predikatieve Expressie van Zelfopenbaring in Oudoosterse Teksten En Deutero-Jesaja* (Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1980).

<sup>717</sup> This article is written in Dutch and I utilised the translator programme. See Manfred Weippert, “De Herkomst van Het Heilsorakel Voor Israël Bij Deutero-Jesaja,” *NTT* 36, no. 1 (1982): 10–1.

<sup>718</sup> Ibid., 9–11; Manfred Weippert, “Assyrische Prophetien Der Zeit Asarhaddons Und Assurbanipals,” in *Assyrian Royal Inscriptions: New Horizons in Literary, Ideological and Historical Analysis: Papers of a Symposium Held in Cetona (Siena) June 26-28, 1980*, ed. Frederick Mario Fales, OAC 17 (Roma: Istituto per l’Oriente, 1981), 108–9.

<sup>719</sup> Parpola in the State Archives of Assyria series (SAA 9) introduces the new translation of the oracle collections—“Oracles of Encouragement to Esarhaddon” (1), “Oracles Concerning Babylon and the Stabilization of the King’s Rule” (2), “The Covenant of Aššur” (3), “Fragment of a Collection of Encouragement Oracles” (4)—and of oracle reports—“Reports to Esarhaddon” (5-6), “Reports to Assurbanipal” (7-13). There, he proposes structural and thematic elements of Assyrian prophecies which would be compared to biblical prophetic forms, although each oracle does not completely reflect the list of elements; (1) “Word of Ištar” (2) “address”, (3) self-identification, (4) “fear not” formula, (5) past

### 5.2.2.1 *Oracles of Encouragement to Esarhaddon (SAA 9 1)*

The first noteworthy Assyrian prophecy is the oracles which encourage the king of Assyria Esarhaddon (681-669 BCE) and which have striking resemblances with the OT prophecies as well as with Deutero-Isaiah (SAA 9 1).<sup>720</sup> This collection consists of ten different prophetic oracles, and there are two oracles (SAA 9 1.6, 1.9) which do not record the names of the prophet/prophetess.<sup>721</sup> The first oracle addressed to Esarhaddon with the encouraging word ‘fear not’ is likely to be spoken ‘before the decisive battle fought in 681-XI’:<sup>722</sup>

*[Esarh]addon, king of the lands, fear [not]! What wind has risen against you, whose wing I have not broken? Your enemies will roll before your feet like ripe apples. I am the Great Lady; I am Ištar of Arbela, who cast your enemies before your feet. What words have I spoken to you that you could not reply upon? I am Ištar of Arbela. I will flay your enemies and give them to you. I am Ištar of Arbela. I will go before you and behind you. Fear not! You are paralysed, but in the midst of woe I will rise and sit down (beside you). (SAA 9 1.1)*

After this, the subsequent seven oracles (1.2-8) describe the journey to the capital city Nineveh after the battle and the final two oracles (1.9-10) refer to the glorious celebration of their victory and the kingly ruling in the palace.<sup>723</sup> In particular, Parpola indicates the allusion between SAA 9 1.1 i 22ff (‘I am Ištar of Arbela. I will go before you and behind you’) and Isa 45:2 (‘I (Yahweh) will go before you (Cyrus) and level the swelling hills’).<sup>724</sup> Other comparable texts are:<sup>725</sup>

*What words have I spoken to you that you could not rely upon? (SAA 9 1.1, i 15-17)*

---

support, (6) “present/future support”, (7) “demand for praise”, and (8) “cultic demands”. Parpola, *Assyrian*, lxiv–lxvii; I mainly refer to Parpola’s work in title and translation.

<sup>720</sup> For the text, see *ibid.*, 3–11; Nissinen, *Prophets and Prophecy*, 101–11; Pritchard, *ANET*, 449–50.

<sup>721</sup> See Parpola, *Assyrian*, 9–10.

<sup>722</sup> *Ibid.*, lxviii.

<sup>723</sup> *Ibid.*, lxviii–lxix.

<sup>724</sup> *Ibid.*, 5.

<sup>725</sup> See Manfred Weippert, “Aspekte Israelischer Prophetie Im Lichte Verwandter Erscheinungen Des Alten Orients,” in *Ad Bene et Fideliter Seminandum: Festgabe Für Karlheinz Deller Zum 21. Februar 1987*, ed. Ursula Magen and Gerlinde Mauer, AOAT Bd. 220 (Kevelaer: Neukirchen-Vluyn: Butzon & Bercker; Neukirchener Verlag, 1988), 316–7; Parpola, *Assyrian*, 4, 10.

*‘Could you not rely on the previous utterance which I spoke to you? Now you can rely on this later one too.’ (SAA 9 1.10, vi 7-12)  
 Long ago I announced what would first happen, I revealed it with my own mouth; suddenly I acted and it came about ... I told you of these things long ago, and declared them before they came about, so that you could not say, ‘This was my idol’s doing ... he ordained them.’ You have heard what I said; consider it well, and you must admit the truth of it. Now I show you new things, hidden things which you did not know before. (Isa 48:3-6; Parpola’s translation)*

Harner directed his attention to five Arbela oracles in the time of Esarhaddon and then divided similarities into four points; ‘the direct address to the recipient’, ‘the reassurance, “fear not”’, ‘the divine self-predication’, and ‘the message of salvation’.<sup>726</sup> Agreeing with Begrich’s view, that Deutero-Isaiah used these patterns and forms of the priestly salvation oracle, Harner maintains that Deutero-Isaiah utilised this widespread form in Isa 41:8-13, 14-16, 43:1-7, and 44:1-5, and that this ‘priestly salvation oracle’ was learnt and adopted in the Jerusalem temple.<sup>727</sup>

#### 5.2.2.2 *The Covenant of Aššur (SAA 9 3) and Reports to Assurbanipal (SAA 9 7-11)*

Another important text can be found in the sources of Aššur’s covenant with Esarhaddon which possibly was recited in ‘Esarhaddon’s enthronement festival in Ešarra, the Aššur temple of Assur’,<sup>728</sup> and which is dated as the earliest source among three Collections (SAA 9 1-3).<sup>729</sup> Parpola regards this Collection as oracles spoken by a single prophet *La-dagail-ili* and divides them into two parts: tripartite prophecy by Aššur and divine words ‘of Ištar of Arbela to

---

<sup>726</sup> Harner also gives examples of other oracles addressed to his son Ashurbanipal (668-633 BCE), and the inscription of King Zakir of Hamath. See Harner, “Salvation,” 419.

<sup>727</sup> This conclusion of Harner is similar to that of other form-critical scholars (e.g., Westermann), noting that Deutero-Isaiah considered it as “a distinct, self-contained form of speech” associated with royal figures. See *ibid.*, 433–4.

<sup>728</sup> Nissinen, *Prophets and Prophecy*, 119.

<sup>729</sup> Parpola, *Assyrian*, lxx.

Esharhaddon'.<sup>730</sup> Especially, he mentions the connection between Isa 45:5ff and SAA 9 3.3 ii 24; also the similarity with Ezek 38:23; 13:13ff; Jer 16:21; Isa 12:1.<sup>731</sup>

With oracles or reports addressed to Esarhaddon, reports to Assurbanipal (668-627 BCE) are significant as having similarities with Deutero-Isaiah (SAA 9 7-11). The 'Prophecies for the Crown Prince Assurbanipal' (no. 7) is a report to the king Assurbanipal delivered by the prophetess Mullissu-kabtāt from the goddess Mullissu, the wife of Aššur. It consists of some structural elements of addressing the receiver, the 'fear-not' formula, and divine support for the kings; the 'Words of Encouragement to Assurbanipal' (no. 9) contain the address and divine support for the kings. In particular, the reports in nos. 7 and 9 have affinities with the oracle in SAA 3 3 ('Assurbanipal's Hymn to Ištar of Nineveh and Arbela'), and no. 9 has resemblances with SAA 3 13 ('Dialogue of Assurbanipal with Nabû').<sup>732</sup> Weippert also compares several passages between the passages of Deutero-Isaiah and Neo-Assyrian oracles. He links Assyrian oracles in the 'Second Oracle of Salvation' of 'the Covenant of Aššur' (SAA 9 3.3) and 'Prophecies for the Crown Prince Assurbanipal' (SAA 9 7) with texts in Isa 48:12a-16d, 42:5-9, 41:21-29, and argues that these cases are probably quotations from, or references to, other texts.<sup>733</sup>

### 5.2.3 Egyptian Prophetic Literature

Egyptian texts have not been compared with Hebrew prophetic literature to the same extent as Mesopotamian prophetic oracles. The existence of Egyptian prophecy or prophetic tradition, which parallels the conception of biblical prophecy, has been subject to controversy, and

---

<sup>730</sup> Ibid., lxiii–lxiv; On the contrary, de Jong rejects the first part belongs to prophetic oracle. See Jong, *Isaiah*, 173–4.

<sup>731</sup> See the corresponding footnote. Parpola, *Assyrian*, 24.

<sup>732</sup> See Parpola, *Assyrian*, lxx–lxxi.

<sup>733</sup> See Manfred Weippert, "'Das Frühere, Siehe, Ist Eingetroffen...' : Über Selbstzitate Im Altorientalischen Prophetenspruch," in *Oracles et Prophéties Dans l'Antiquité* (Paris: De Boccard, 1997), 160–1.

Egyptologists in fact have hardly spoken of the prophetic genre in recent studies.<sup>734</sup> The main reason for this is that, unlike biblical prophecy, the words of the messenger in Egyptian literature do not come from divine authority, although they in a general sense include observations of the political and social corruption and threaten coming judgment arising from the failure of cultic practices.<sup>735</sup> For example, *The Words of Khakheperreseneb* laments the despair in the land, but does not predict the course of coming events; most of the prophetic works in Egypt seem to imply deliberate political propaganda, and are not pure prophecy in the biblical sense.

Moreover, Egyptian prophetic literature has frequently become muddled with the categorisation of wisdom literature. For instance, the following five books might probably be treated in the range of Egyptian prophecy: (1) *The Prophecy of Neferti*, (2) *The Words of Khakheperreseneb*, (3) *The Dialogue of a Man with His Soul*, (4) *The Protests of Eloquent Peasant*, and (5) *The Dialogue of Ipuur and the Lord to the Limit*. However, in general these prophetic texts have been compared with biblical wisdom books like Job, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes.<sup>736</sup> Nonetheless, Egyptian texts have a few resemblances with biblical prophetic books at some points, in that both deal with the motifs of sufferings and deliverance and with criticism of contemporary society. At least two compositions—*the Prophecy of Neferti* and *the Words of Khakheperreseneb* (though no element of prediction)—are likely related to Deutero-Isaiah.

---

<sup>734</sup> For a noteworthy study of the literary genre in the Middle Kingdom Egypt, see Richard B. Parkinson, “Types of Literature in the Middle Kingdom,” in *Ancient Egyptian Literature: History and Forms*, ed. Antonio Loprieno, *Probleme der Ägyptologie* 10 (Leiden; NY: Brill, 1996), 297–312.

<sup>735</sup> John H. Walton, *Ancient Israelite Literature in Its Cultural Context: A Survey of Parallels Between Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Texts* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1990), 213.

<sup>736</sup> Nili Shupak, comparing Egyptian prophetic literature with biblical prophecy, argues that “there was no prophetic tradition in Egypt that corresponded to the prophecy of the Old Testament” See Nili Shupak, “Egyptian ‘Prophecy’ and Biblical Prophecy: Did the Phenomenon of Prophecy, in the Biblical Sense, Exist in Ancient Egypt?,” *JEOL*, no. 31 (1989): 18. Furthermore, she argues after broad research of the literary features of Egyptian prophetic texts that the five Egyptian texts suggested above should be considered as Egyptian wisdom literature. See Nili Shupak, “Egyptian ‘Prophetic’ Writings and Biblical Wisdom Literature,” *BN*, no. 54 (1990): 81–102.

### 5.2.3.1 *The Prophecy of Neferti*

The Egyptian composition associated with Deutero-Isaiah is what is generally called ‘the Prophecy of Neferti’ or ‘the Protocol of Neferti’ (abb., *Neferti*) and a single complete manuscript is preserved in a papyrus St. Petersburg 1116B in the Eighteenth Dynasty.<sup>737</sup> This text is probably related to a national calamity which precedes a deliverance by a future king called Ameny who may be King Amenemhet I of the Twelfth Dynasty, but, generally scholars, based on the eulogy of King Amenemhat I (1990-1960 BCE), assigned this text to his reign or afterwards.<sup>738</sup> This work, like *Ipuur*, could be classified as ‘prophecy’—of course, whether Neferti’s words may be grouped as ‘prophecy’ is doubtful—and deals with national disasters, but is neither a real prophetic form nor is it related to historical events known to us. By describing king Amenemhat I (1991-1962 BCE) as an ideal king, rather, the text seems to contain royal propagandic elements.<sup>739</sup>

This discourse begins with the words of King Sneferu (2575-2551 BCE) of the Fourth Dynasty who summoned the chief lector-priest named Neferti who foretells what will happen and who will tell him ‘a few perfect words’ (P 8) in the Old Kingdom. Neferti then, before the king, speaks of his prophecy and the coming disasters arising from the drought:

*And the river of Egypt is dry, so that water is crossed on foot’ (P 26).*

And he foretells the social chaos and the geographical confusion resulting from invasion, and the lament of the prophet is stopped by the emergence of the victorious king Ameny; he says that this redeeming king will bring political reunion and moral recovery to the country. Finally it ends up with a eulogy for the king and the restoration of order.

*In fact, a king from the south will come, called Ameny. He is the son of a woman of Bowland; he is a child of Southern Egypt.’ (P 57-58)*

---

<sup>737</sup> Pritchard, *ANET*, 444–6; Lichtheim, *AEL I*, 1:139–45; Hallo, *COS I*, I:106–10; Parkinson, *Sinuhe*, 131–43. I use the translation of Parkinson.

<sup>738</sup> Parkinson, *Culture*, 304.

<sup>739</sup> See Lichtheim, *AEL I*, 1:139.



*The people of his time will be joyful, and the gentleman will make his name, for eternity and all time! (P 61)*

### 5.2.3.2 *The Words of Khakheperreseneb*

This text is preserved in a writing board (British Museum EA 5645) which is dated to the early Eighteenth Dynasty, while the original text is likely to belong to the Middle Kingdom, and would not be earlier than the late Twelfth Dynasty,<sup>740</sup> since the name Khakheperreseneb seems to be derived from the royal name of king Khakheperre Senwosret II of the Twelfth Dynasty.<sup>741</sup> This work is a monologue in the form of a lament, and shows an inner dialogue between a man and his heart like the *Eloquent Peasant* and the *Debate between a Man and His Soul*. In it, the priest (also called Ankhu) meditates upon the destroyed land, and sees mourning and grief amongst the people. This work is closely associated with *Neferti* and *Ipuur*, in that both address the destruction of the land and express its wailing, but *Khakheperreseneb* neither reflects a political situation<sup>742</sup> nor predicts things to come in the land. Instead, this composition is usually related to the wholly personal thoughts from the author's observations and to the heartfelt agony from his past and present experience; *Khakheperreseneb* is certainly standing on the intersection of inner suffering and of external turmoil in the uncertainty of reality.

To what extent does Deutero-Isaiah overlap with these two Egyptian texts? We have few commonalities in linguistic expressions and literary structure between them. But, there are some general similarities in themes which we can confirm. Shupak mentions two common motifs between biblical and Egyptian prophecy—(1) 'the disasters-redemption motif', (2) 'the portrayal of a redeemer'—and in particular, the motifs of 'admonitions' concerning the perversion of social order, and 'deliverance and consolation' which have significance in the

---

<sup>740</sup> See *ibid.*, 1:145.

<sup>741</sup> I use the translation of Parkinson. See Parkinson, *Sinuhe*, 144–50; Pritchard, *ANET*, 421–5; Lichtheim, *AEI I*, 1:145–9; Hallo, *COS I*, I:104–6. For a detailed study, see Parkinson, *Culture*, 200–4, 304–5.

<sup>742</sup> Lichtheim, *AEI I*, 1:145.

comparison between Egyptian prophecy and Isaiah 40-66,<sup>743</sup> but we may also see these similarities in other Hebrew prophetic literature as well.

#### 5.2.4 Evaluation: Deutero-Isaiah's Reference to Foreign Literature

Was Deutero-Isaiah aware of the collections of specific foreign texts which are discussed above? This statement may not be readily sustained when one realise such widespread sources similar to Deutero-Isaiah. Let us look at the case for literary dependence on a specific text. The customary pattern which exists in the Cyrus Cylinder about political propaganda and deliverance from national distress is not limited to the region and time of the Neo-Babylonian Empire. We have many parallels concerning the divine election of the king by his gods and the king's role as divine envoy in Ugaritic and Sumerian royal inscriptions and in the Hebrew Bible. Hans Barstad in several places has supported the idea that detailed information about Cyrus would have been well known to those who lived in the Syria-Palestine region as well as to the Jewish diasporas in the region of Babylon.<sup>744</sup> Especially, he examines two cases of Babylonian literary influence from the Cyrus Cylinder and the form of divine self-predication.<sup>745</sup>

Firstly, there are several examples where reference to Cyrus was common in Babylonian literary heritage. The most frequently cited parallel with Deutero-Isaiah appears in the expression, 'Thus Yahweh said this to his anointed one, to Cyrus, whom I have taken hold of (יָחִיזְקֵהוּ) by the right hand, to subdue nations before him' in Isa 45:1a (cf. 42:6). From this parallel, it has been argued that the idea of divine election in Marduk's relationship with the

---

<sup>743</sup> See Shupak, "Egyptian 'Prophecy' and Biblical Prophecy," 31–2.

<sup>744</sup> See Hans M. Barstad, "On the So-Called Babylonian Literary Influence in Second Isaiah," *SJOT*, no. 2 (1987): 90–110; *The Myth of the Empty Land: A Study in the History and Archaeology of Judah during the "Exilic" Period* (Oslo: Scandinavian UP, 1996); *The Babylonian Captivity of the Book of Isaiah: "Exilic" Judah and the Provenance of Isaiah 40-55* (Oslo: Novus, 1997).

<sup>745</sup> He notices that "the language of the Cylinder, both with regard to phraseology and content, represents common Babylonian style, and must have been well known all over the Ancient Near East" and that 'the message of the cylinder is so Marduk/Babylonia oriented that it is highly unlikely that any Yahweh prophet could take inspiration from it.' See Barstad, "So-Called," 94.

Cyrus Cylinder was the origin of Deutero-Isaiah's text.<sup>746</sup> However, as Barstad points out, in Oppenheim's translation, the phrase *qa-ta šabātu* in the foreign counterpart of Isa 45:1 has no meaning of 'appointment', 'designation' or 'election'; Oppenheim translates it as 'He scanned and looked (through) all the countries, searching for a righteous ruler willing to lead him (i.e. Marduk)'.<sup>747</sup> The divine election further is a fairly usual concept in other texts such as Ps 2:7 and 110:1-7, and the hiphil form of verb *קָרַן* is not referring to such a particular implication in the present context and is no more than a general term (cf. Job 8:20; Jer 31:32; 41:9, 13; 42:6); in addition, this may be viewed as referring to 'the so-called Zakir inscription, an Aramaic inscription from the 8<sup>th</sup> century B.C.E.' and 'the Moabite Mesha inscription'.<sup>748</sup> Barstad also sustains Kuhrt's claim, that there is no historical linkage between the record of the Cyrus Cylinder and Cyrus in Deutero-Isaiah.<sup>749</sup> According to Rainer Albertz, although the coming divine messenger described in Deutero-Isaiah (Isa 44:24-45:7) generally has been seen as referring to Cyrus the Persian king, the figure in some oracles such as Isa 45:4-7, 45:11-13, and 48:12-15 may refer to King Darius.<sup>750</sup>

Secondly, one can argue from the 'self-predication formula' ('I am God') in Deutero-Isaiah, that this form was influenced by cuneiform texts like *Enuma Elish* and *Oracles of Esarhaddon*.<sup>751</sup> However, we have little evidence to suppose that this idiom was borrowed from specific Neo-Babylonian texts; although there may be a high possibility. Barstad, for example, disagrees with Greßmann's claim that the instance of the 'self-predication' formula in a form of 'hymnic praise' (Isa 48:12-13) is the consequence of Akkadian parallels,<sup>752</sup> and instead he

---

<sup>746</sup> Paul, *Isaiah 40-66*, 188, 252; Kittel, "Cyrus," 160.

<sup>747</sup> *ANET*, 315; A. Leo Oppenheim, "Idiomatic Accadian (Lexicographical Researches)," *JAOS* 61, no. 4 (1941): 251-71.

<sup>748</sup> See Barstad, "So-Called," 97-9; Peterson, "Babylonian," 32.

<sup>749</sup> Kuhrt, "The Cyrus Cylinder and Achaemenid Imperial Policy."

<sup>750</sup> Rainer Albertz, "Darius in Place of Cyrus: The First Edition of Deutero-Isaiah (Isaiah 40.1-52.12) in 521 BCE," *JSOT* 27, no. 3 (2003): 371-83.

<sup>751</sup> Pritchard, *ANET*, 60-72, 449-50, 605.

<sup>752</sup> See Barstad, "So-Called," 101-10.

notices that this formula ‘is found not only in biblical or Aramaic texts, but it is known in several Ancient Near Eastern cultures.’<sup>753</sup> Such literary traces of Babylonian influence on Deutero-Isaiah must be seen in respect of the cultural inter-relationship in the ancient Near East. For example, literary custom can go back to the earlier period of Akkadian civilization or to the other cultural background of Egyptian or Ugaritic literature. When literary affinities between Babylonian royal inscriptions and Deutero-Isaiah appear repeatedly in ancient Near Eastern literature, it is important to accept that those sorts of myth, creation narrative, and court scenes appearing in Babylonian documents are what can easily be found in the oldest Sumerian inscriptions, and even in the Assyrian inscriptions;<sup>754</sup> i.e., Grayson, in his book *Assyrian Royal Inscriptions*, maintains that the origin of royal inscriptions in Assyria and Babylon probably lies in the earliest Sumerian inscriptions.

Over all, literary resemblances between these ancient documents do not have to be interpreted as the direct knowledge of a particular composition or a single literary tradition which biblical authors knew, but they need to be dealt with as the mixed influence of prevalent well-known oral-written texts and styles.

### 5.3 *Job and Deutero-Isaiah in ancient Near Eastern Culture*

#### 5.3.1 General Influence

Although some of the arguments, which propose that the two books were dependent in literary terms on non-Israelite writings, do not have sufficient evidence to carry conviction, it may be reasonable to notice that those claims have valid points in their favour—though not, indeed, as

---

<sup>753</sup> Ibid., 106.

<sup>754</sup> See Peterson, “Babylonian,” 60–77; Also refer to Stephen Herbert Langdon, *Building Inscriptions of the Neo-Babylonian Empire*. (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1905); Albert Kirk Grayson, *Assyrian Royal Inscriptions*, Records of the Ancient Near East (Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz, 1972); Paul R. Berger, *Die Neubabylonischen Königsinschriften: Königsinschriften Des Ausgehenden Babylonischen Reiches (626-539 A. Chr.)*, AOAT Bd. 4/1 (Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker, 1973).

much as their proponents would wish. The diversity shown in resemblances with foreign texts implies how many and varied scribes utilised probable knowledge of ancient literatures and reflected their concern on their writings; the broad influence of the prevalent non-Israelite works would not be wholly cut off. If the foreign literature sheds light on aspects of the relationship between Job and Deutero-Isaiah, what sorts of influence of foreign sources can we find from texts?

#### 5.3.1.1 *Personal and National Suffering*

Foreign texts in Egypt and Mesopotamia relating to the book of Job and Deutero-Isaiah are generally bound up with the issue of human suffering and misery in the individual life and in the world. In Job, suffering and injustice occupy a central theme, although the text of Job is unlikely to give the rational explanation of the innocent sufferer. Let us consider four different literatures: *The Babylonian Job*, *The Protest of the Eloquent Peasant*, *The Epic of Keret*, and Sumerian *Man and His God*. These compositions are dealing with issues of individual tragedies (e.g., individuals, peasant, king); though there are national calamities in the case of *The Dialogue of Ipuur and the Lord of the Limit*. In these texts, restoration of loss and reconciliation of the conflict at the end of the stories are given to sufferers; an exception is in *A Pessimistic Dialogue between Master and Servant*. Although the detailed literary descriptions are diverse and they do not all deal with the case of the purely innocent sufferer, all of them are engaged with the sufferer's motif which is the same as in the book of Job.

Likewise, the most analogous motif which Deutero-Isaiah shares with the foreign texts concerns human suffering and affliction, although the suffering in Deutero-Isaiah is different from the undeserved suffering of a pious individual like Job. Its main social content is linked with the national disaster and chaos that the Judean community suffered during Babylonian exile, and this is certainly combined with the theme of the suffering servant in Isa 52:13-53:12. Its fundamental background in terms of nationwide pandemonium and suppression by natural, political or military forces already appeared in most non-Israelite compositions like *The Cyrus*

*Cylinder*, *The Oracles of Esarhaddon*, *The Prophecy of Neferti*, and *The Words of Khakheperreseneb*, where they all reflect the chaotic social situation. Moreover, in those texts such as the *Neferti* and Assyrian prophetic oracles, the earnest desire for a new kingship to deliver the nation from chaotic conditions is present, and is contained in a divine promise to support their kings against their enemies.

### 5.3.1.2 *Literary Dialogue in Job*

The literary genre shared by Job and non-Israelite sources, we say, is ‘dialogue’, which usually consists of the debate or discussion between two speakers and which explores questions of human suffering. It is tempting to assert that the author of Job was familiar with the idea of using the framework of dialogic form to draw attention to individual suffering and social chaos. Although it accordingly seems to be a prevailing form shared in ancient Near East culture, this form cannot be simply compared with the structure of the Platonic dialogue in Greek culture or with the modern dialogic genre.<sup>755</sup> What we can confirm is that the author of Job seems to be aware of the dialogic format and to adopt it in the text and context of a complicated Israelite literature.

Except for the dialogic form, there is almost nothing which can link texts in Job to the Babylonian compositions—*Dialogue between a Man and His God*, the *Babylonian Job*, the *Babylonian Theodicy*, and *Pessimism*—and Egyptian texts—the *Dialogue of a Man with His Soul*, the *Protests of Eloquent Peasant*, and *Ipuur*. Van der Toorn for instance, proposes the literary ‘dialogue’ as the one of prevalent genres, comparing three ancient texts, ‘The Man Who

---

<sup>755</sup> Denning-Bolle regards a literary dialogue in Akkadian literature as an established genre in the disputation and ritual setting. See Sara Denning-Bolle, *Wisdom in Akkadian Literature: Expression, Instruction, Dialogue*, Mededelingen en verhandelingen van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap “Ex Oriente Lux” 28 (Leiden: Ex Oriente Lux, 1992), 85–133.

Was Tired of Life’, ‘The Babylonian Theodicy’, and the Book of Job.<sup>756</sup> According to van der Toorn, the dialogue genre in each literature is placed in various literary settings such as ‘legal metaphors’, ‘judicial trials’ or ‘wisdom disputation’,<sup>757</sup> and further it combines the subject-matter of theodicy with other pessimistic literatures which reflect the mood of an individual’s chaos and distress in its own right. On the contrary, the structure of *The Protests of the Eloquent Peasant* seems to escape the dialogue genre and to adopt ‘tale’ as a prominent genre, but in the core petitions it seems to adopt the ‘internal dialogue’ (or monologue) where the correspondent is silent.<sup>758</sup> The literature most similar to the book of Job, the Sumerian ‘Man and His God’ likewise lacks the dialogic form, but instead includes the long monologue expressed to his deity. The Ugaritic composition *The Epic of Keret* has less dialogue than other compositions, but it also includes a dialogue between Keret and the supreme god El.

Dialogue was the literary tool used to reflect the many voices of ancient writers. Such a literary dialogue was very popular in the Middle Kingdom Egyptian (1980-1630 BCE), in the Babylonian—both in the Old Babylonian (2000-1595 BCE) and Kassite (1550-1155 BCE) period—Sumerian, Ugarit, and Hebrew texts. For Middle Egyptian compositions, Parkinson says:

*The complaint-and-answer character of theodicy is particularly suited to the form of a dispute, and theodicy themes are most fully articulated in the discourse and dialogue genres, although the narratives often embody the issue of divine justice through anomic experiences, and the teachings assert Maat by guiding the audience through pragmatic problems of social behavior.*<sup>759</sup>

Those non-Israelite texts wholly or partly revolve around the literary genre of dialogue in its own right, as they are applied into different contents and different styles, and forms. Indeed, it

---

<sup>756</sup> In conclusion he says that “on the strength of these formal and material resemblances, one is led to posit the existence of the literary dialogue as a distinct literary genre in the ancient Near East.” See van der Toorn, “Dialogue,” 71.

<sup>757</sup> See *ibid.*, 62–5.

<sup>758</sup> Parkinson points out that “Khakheperreseneb”, “Sasobek”, and “the Eloquent Peasant” fall into this pattern. See Parkinson, *Culture*, 200.

<sup>759</sup> *Ibid.*, 137–8.

may be supposed that scribes were aware of a literary genre of dialogue common in other cultures.

### 5.3.1.3 *Self-Presentation Form in Deutero-Isaiah*

Numerous studies about the relationship between the Deutero-Isaiah and non-Israelite sources discussed above have indicated the shared form of ‘self-presentation’ (or ‘self-predication’)—‘I am X’. This includes the basic and derived forms where the subject, the divine ‘I’ becomes god(s) or king(s) as representatives of gods. This kind of study has in particular focused on Assyrian and Babylonian hymns that are related to the form in Deutero-Isaiah.<sup>760</sup> Friedrich Stummer in his 1926 article argued that the Babylonian hymns to Shamash and Marduk are associated with the Hebrew Psalms and with Deutero-Isaiah’s hymns;<sup>761</sup> in particular, *Enuma Elish* is the most significant composition in parallel with Deutero-Isaiah’s hymnic forms. Hyacinthe Dion representatively claims that there was influence of hymnic forms in Mesopotamian literature on Deutero-Isaiah with regard to the divine self-predication that would range from the Old Babylonian period to the Neo-Babylonian and Neo-Assyrian periods.<sup>762</sup> So, there is little reason to think that the divine self-predication form was exclusively developed in the Israelite tradition as an integral part. The self-presentation form definitely was a prevalent

---

<sup>760</sup> For the entire summary of the self-presentation formula in Deutero-Isaiah and Mesopotamian sources, see the following two references; Peterson, “Babylonian,” 105–34; Eugene H. Merrill, “Isaiah 40–55 as Anti-Babylonian Polemic,” *GTJ* 8, no. 1 (1987): 11–8. For early works, see Friedrich Stummer, “Einige Keilschriftliche Parallelen Zu Jes.40–66,” *JBL* 45, no. 1–2 (1926): 171–89; Walther Zimmerli, “Ich Bin Yahweh,” in *Geschichte Und Altes Testament: Albrecht Alt Zum 70. Geburtstag Dargebracht* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1953), 179–209.

<sup>761</sup> Stummer, “Einige Keilschriftliche”; For the parallels with the Hebrew Psalters, see Friedrich Stummer, *Sumerisch-Akkadische Parallelen Zum Aufbau Alttestamentlicher Psalmen*, SGKA 11. Bd., 1./2. Hft (Paderborn: F. Schöningh, 1922).

<sup>762</sup> See Hyacinthe M. Dion, “Le Genre Littéraire Sumérien de L’‘hymne À Soi-Même’ et Quelques Passages Du Deutéro-Isaie,” *RB* 74, no. 2 (1967): 215–34; “Patriarchal Traditions and the Literary Form of the ‘Oracle of Salvation,’” *CBQ* 29, no. 2 (1967): 198–206.



literary device in the time of Deutero-Isaiah.<sup>763</sup> Except for the Egyptian compositions, the non-Israelite sources, discussed above, are almost all linked with this form of self-presentation.

Let us consider three ancient Near Eastern resources: the *Zakkur Stela* of the early eighth century which was discovered in the city Hamath of Syria,<sup>764</sup> the Neo-Babylonian source *The Cyrus Cylinder*, and the Neo-Assyrian oracle *Sinqiša-amur of Arbela* (SAA 9 1.2). Not surprisingly, all these examples have the element of the self-presentation form, which corresponds to the phrase ‘I am Yahweh’ in Deutero-Isaiah and which in many cases combines with the promise of deliverance and support, and with praising their deities; this form to some extent is more prominent in Sumero-Akkadian literature than Egyptian literature. This commonality may attest that the author of Deutero-Isaiah was aware of these prevalent forms and adopted them to highlight the divine power among other deities and to assure suffering people of future help.

### 5.3.2 Differences in Context, Idea, and Thought

Although authors of Job and Deutero-Isaiah would have a broad knowledge related to those foreign texts, the two books may be differentiated from certain religious ideas or interests emerged from non-Israelite resources. Each book to some degree needs to be read and viewed against the different ideas of other ancient cultures, since it reflects unique theological ideas in Israelite scribal culture as well as the general worldview in the Mesopotamian and Egyptian literature. The concept of divine justice is an obvious example of this. The subject-matter of divine justice in the two books is certainly common in Middle Kingdom Egyptian compositions. John Gray asserts that the ‘Divine Order’, which is the general theme in the ancient Near East,

---

<sup>763</sup> For instance, oracles of Mari (fifth Mari letter) already contained this form. See Claus Westermann, *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech* (London: Lutterworth, 1967), 125; Morgan L. Phillips, “Divine Self-Predication in Deutero-Isaiah,” *BR* 16 (1971): 36.

<sup>764</sup> Nissinen, *Prophets and Prophecy*, 203–7.

is the ultimate resolution of the questions proposed by humans in Job.<sup>765</sup> Commenting on cases in the wisdom psalms, Gray states:

*[T]he purpose of the text was not to accentuate the problem but to defend the belief in God's Order by seeking a solution beyond philosophy in religion. This is the solution also in the Book of Job*<sup>766</sup>

Nonetheless, we cannot regard the idea of divine justice—*Maat* ('Order', 'Justice' or 'Law')<sup>767</sup>—in the literature of the middle Egyptian Kingdom as similar to that of Israelite scribal culture. Generally, this is evident in the issue of the concept of god(s). There is the thought of a single God Yahweh in Israelite religion who takes control of all the nations including Israel, while the ancient Egyptian and Mesopotamian texts believe in polytheism. So, when the subject of justice in Israelite writings is compared to that in other cultures, they are not identical with one another in their own ideas; though later Egyptian literature is quite different.

Let us consider the Middle Egyptian text *The Prophecy of Neferti*. The reason why the world has gone wrong with great uncertainty in Neferti is because *Maat* is being compromised, and consequently with the arrival of a new king, Order will be finally restored. When *Maat* is weakened and then the world order begins to collapse, we may see fallen Egypt and the chaos and turmoil of society (lines P 54-56). Finally, *Maat* will be standing by the future coming of Ameny the ideal king; 'Truth will return to its proper place, with Chaos driven outside' (lines P 67). This seems to be identical with Israel's propagandistic purposes, but there is no retribution and judgment by deities in Neferti. In Old and Middle Kingdom Egypt, gods do not automatically secure individuals' prosperity in the world in response to their behaviour, but they give security when humans co-operate with them in maintaining the order of the world. In many cases, humans can attempt to modify the ways of *Maat* or to turn to other deities. For

---

<sup>765</sup> See Gray, "Near," 253, 268.

<sup>766</sup> Ibid., 269.

<sup>767</sup> "'Order' is the fundamental religious, social, and abstract concept of ma'at, and 'disorder' is izfet, the opposite of ma'at, associated with the world outside creation." Baines, "Society," 128.

instance, in *the Protests of the Eloquent Peasant*, Parkinson comments that the words of the peasant highlight ‘the relativization of *Maat* in this world once more, by expressing the peasant’s need to turn to an otherworldly judge’ (B2 113-15).<sup>768</sup> Literary features of early Egyptian compositions are not about divine retribution or judgment on individuals, but that becomes a feature of late Egyptian literature. Since right judgment, emphasised in the Middle Egyptian literature, comes in the afterlife, retribution in the present life is treated as a trivial matter;<sup>769</sup> while the position of the dead in ‘a land of the dead’ in Babylonian literature is uncertain, and the concept of judgment of the dead does not exist in Sumero-Mesopotamian literature.<sup>770</sup> Moreover, it seems that the book of Job adopts the ancient notion of justice, but its implicit idea is distinct from the concept of *Maat* in Middle Egyptian literature; the concept of justice as found in the book of Job is not in the hands of gods of the Old and Middle Kingdom Egypt, but it may be in the New Kingdom (1540-1070 BCE) and late period Egypt (715-332 BCE) which is contemporary in Israel.<sup>771</sup>

On the other hand, this idea of divine justice in Mesopotamia is understood in a different way from that of the Israelite idea. For instance, we can take the Gilgamesh Epic,<sup>772</sup> the most famous Akkadian composition. Gilgamesh and Enkidu slew the monstrous Humbaba and the Bull of Heaven belonging to the deities. Both figures offended gods and provoked divine anger by killing animals and the gods decided to kill Enkidu inflicting retribution on him. Then, what caused the sudden death of Enkidu? Was it the same divine retribution which we can see in

---

<sup>768</sup> Parkinson, *Culture*, 170.

<sup>769</sup> See Bricker, “Innocent Suffering in Egypt,” 96; R. J. Williams, “Theodicy in the Ancient Near East,” in *Theodicy in the Old Testament*, ed. James L. Crenshaw, IRT 4 (Philadelphia: London: Fortress; SPCK, 1983), 48.

<sup>770</sup> See Bricker, “Innocent Suffering in Mesopotamia,” 213; Helmer Ringgren, *Religions of the Ancient Near East*, trans. John Sturdy (London: SPCK, 1973), 46–8, 121–3, 175–6.

<sup>771</sup> Cf., Assmann notices that “under various traditional names, especially Amun (and then Isis in Greco-Roman antiquity), the single god became an object of popular piety and the protagonist of magical texts, from Ramesside times down to the Greek magical papyri.” Jan Assmann, *The Search for God in Ancient Egypt* (Ithaca; London: Cornell UP, 2001), 13.

<sup>772</sup> Pritchard, *ANET*, 72–99; Hallo, *COS I*, I:458–60.

Israelite literature? Rather than a moral decision made as a result of just judgment, it is no more than an arbitrary reaction to human misbehaviour. For another example, when considering both the book of Job and *the Babylonian Job*, they involve a human character who cannot understand the reasons why he has to be punished by God, and the common topics between them are the hidden divine motive and the problem of understanding suffering. As discussed above, substantial Mesopotamian texts are interested in these shared themes, but it does not mean that they all belong to a sort of ‘righteous sufferer’ texts as the case of the pious Job; God’s justice and moral retribution in Job is completely different from those described in Mesopotamian literature.

Furthermore, Deutero-Isaiah may be differentiated from the wide-ranging context of other non-Israelite texts, and from even Job. Deutero-Isaiah has fewer affinities with earlier foreign literature than the book of Job and is more associated with the contemporary non-Israelite sources such as the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian literature. In contrast to the book of Job which does not draw upon literary sources about the history of Israel, Deutero-Isaiah is drawing heavily on types of literature known in the Israelite context and is much shaped by certain knowledge of Israelite prophetic texts. Moreover, the theme of human suffering in Deutero-Isaiah occurs in the historical context of the national disaster which had befallen Israel, and these are very Israelite ideas found almost exclusively in biblical literature. It is hard to see other contemporary texts which have similar religious ideology with detailed events in human history; Deutero-Isaiah envisages the deliverance of all the nations by Yahweh’s power, while Babylonian royal inscriptions mainly stress military conquest.

### 5.3.3 Considerations

Finally, there may be some individual points shared by Job and Deutero-Isaiah that may offer insights into the date of those books; though we would not trace back any particular dates from linguistic characteristic. Central to the entire language in Job’s dialogue and Deutero-Isaiah’s speeches is the prominent form of trial or disputation which commonly emerges in ancient Near

Eastern literature, in particular, in Neo-Babylonian literature. F. Rachel Magdalene recently examined resemblances between Neo-Babylonian litigation procedure and the book of Job, and she then proposed that suffering, divine action, and lawsuit in the ancient context of theodicy are related to Job's legal disputation in disease, disability and disaster, and that there is a 'direct influence on that of Israel during the period when the author of Job created this work.'<sup>773</sup> It is assumed by Magdalene that the author of Job intentionally used litigation documents of the Neo-Babylonian period to create Job's text. In the same way, it has been maintained by many exegetes that the lengthy speeches of Deutero-Isaiah aim at attacking Babylonian foreign gods and they may be interpreted as using the polemic or lawsuit languages of foreign texts, in particular Babylonian sources.<sup>774</sup> If the arguments of Magdalene and other researchers are correct, it would be appropriate to conclude that these scribal texts were broadly shaped by legal language in Babylonian texts, although scribes would not use a specific text nor collections of cuneiform texts. Therefore, we may cautiously suppose that the Neo-Babylonian period and the years following are the most probable times for the formation of the two books.

#### 5.4 Conclusion

The fact that both Job and Deutero-Isaiah have been closely associated with non-Israelite texts does not mean that scribes read all these specific non-Israelite texts and directly referred to

---

<sup>773</sup> Magdalene alongside Dick, Gemser, Sheldon, Westbrook argues that "the author of Job incorporated the worldview reflected in the Mesopotamian ritual incantations, hymns, prayers, and theodicies in shaping his book". F. Rachel Magdalene, *On the Scales of Righteousness Neo-Babylonian Trial Law and the Book of Job* (Providence, Rhode Island: Brown Judaic Studies, 2007), 24, 28–9; F. Rachel Magdalene, "The ANE Legal Origins of Impairment as Theological Disability and the Book of Job," *PRS* 34, no. 1 (2007): 23–59; Michael B. Dick, "Legal Metaphor in Job 31," *CBQ* 41, no. 1 (1979): 37–50; Linda Jean Sheldon, "The Book of Job as Hebrew Theodicy: An Ancient Near Eastern Intertextual Conflict Between Law and Cosmology" (PhD, University of California, Berkeley, 2002); B. Gemser, "The Rib- or Controversy Pattern in Hebrew Mentality," in *Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East: Presented to Professor Harold Henry Rowley by the Society for Old Testament Study, in Association with the Editorial Board of Vetus Testamentum, in Celebration of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday, 24 March 1955*, SVT 3 (Leiden: Brill, 1955), 120–37.

<sup>774</sup> For the full study of polemic language against Babylon, see Merrill, "The Language and Literary Characteristics of Isaiah 40-55 as Anti-Babylonian Polemic."

them all; although we cannot completely rule out the possibility. Nonetheless, each book contains significant elements of literary influence from non-Israelite resources; they perhaps shared common interests in the issue of personal and national suffering, and had general knowledge of literary devices such as the dialogic form and the form of self-presentation. Accordingly, we do not need to see either given text as an ‘untypical’ or ‘non-Israelite’ book, but we may suppose from both texts that scribes had some exposure to foreign texts and ideas. This lends weight to the idea that scribal culture was neither isolated nor exceptional in its character. It, however, should be noted rather that biblical writings such as Job and Deutero-Isaiah are differentiated from other foreign texts by such things as certain religious ideas or interests, and such differences might affirm what we expect: that scribes may have had cultural knowledge of ancient literature, yet preserving their distinct identity among other nations.

## Chapter 6 Scribal Ideas in Job and Deutero-Isaiah

Job and Deutero-Isaiah are two different types of literature—the story and dialogue of the innocent sufferer, and the prophetic texts about Israel and the nations— but they actually end up speaking of cultural ideas which scribes were concerned with. Building on the theory of scribalism, certain clarifications should be made in terms of the relationship between Job and Deutero-Isaiah. From now on, it would be necessary to express those similarities, not as the ‘distinctiveness’ of literary dependence, but as the ‘sharedness’ in the historical and social context. In this sense, when we consider where these phrases come from and the reasons why biblical writers are using them, an essential connection could be recognised beyond a set of similar linguistic elements and in the common social and historical context from which these two texts originate; for instance, the phrase—‘non-violence’ or ‘no-violence’ (Job 16:17; Isa 53:9b)—may provide an interestingly shared idea beyond linguistic affinity. However, this is not to exclude the significance of formalised themes presented in most comparative studies in Job and Deutero-Isaiah, nor to overlook verbal parallels between them which deserve our attention. Rather, as we discussed in Chapter 2, proposed common subject-matters and verbal parallels are likely to be commonplace and therefore may not prove the literary and historical relationship between the two books, unless there is precise analogy. Moreover, what we have learned from a variety of interconnections in Chapters 3 and 5 is that authors of Job and Deutero-Isaiah could be aware of Israelite and non-Israelite sources prevalent in their literate community. With the dynamic knowledge preserved in their learned memory and in written collections of early texts, scribes could compose diverse literature which reveal their growing values and interests shared and preferred in their society, and could use them at their disposal in their writing activity. Accordingly, we need to focus upon the interests, thoughts, and ideas which are associated with the contemporary cultural knowledge which Persian period scribes shared.

In this chapter, in order to evince the distinguishing scribal ideas of Job and Deutero-Isaiah, I will identify beliefs shared by the two books and then will compare them with similar ideas in other biblical texts. Firstly, from the two books, two concepts in general can be suggested in the relationship between God and humankind: God's control and God's freedom. Breaking those ideas down into smaller parts, I explore those ideas from the texts, asking the questions: 'How do they understand the concept of divine control over the world?'; 'How do they recognise the relationship between man and God?' Basically it is not the primary issue here whether Jewish scribes had the same views as the Egyptian and Mesopotamian scribes or had different views, but the task is primarily related to the identification of the shared beliefs among scribes of the Persian period. In this process, I exclude ambiguous and unrelated concepts derived from general ideas in the ancient Near East and Israel. Secondly, scribal ideas in the two books will be compared to other biblical materials. It is necessary on the one hand to compare them with other texts which would have been composed, revised or would have existed in the Persian period. On the other hand, I will compare the scribal views with those of the Hellenistic period. For instance, if we see the same notions from the late texts that are similar to scribal ideas found in the two books, it would then be reasonable to suppose that those scribal concepts are a reflection of views held widely in both the Persian and Hellenistic periods. However, unless we find those ideas in the late texts, they are probably not commonly held views in the Hellenistic period, but they are more likely to be shared thoughts in the Persian scribal culture. So, when we look at shared scribal ideas in the two books, we need to distinguish them from other general characteristics in different periods. It is, however, far from my intention to prove in a systematic approach that the two books originated from scribal culture in the Persian period. I will focus on describing that those shared thoughts in the two different types of biblical literature may be interpreted appropriately in the general context of the scribal culture which I have proposed.



## 6.1 *Shared Ideas in Job and Deutero-Isaiah*

What is interesting in Job and Deutero-Isaiah is the specific issue of undeserved suffering (Job 2:3; 9:17; Isa 40:2). For whatever reason, both texts deal with the idea of a person who has suffered in a way that cannot be explained simply by what they have done; though we have already noted that the general theme of suffering servant cannot demonstrate a special relationship between the two books. In such a literary setting of undeserved suffering, the two books share two common concepts of God's control and freedom.

### 6.1.1 God's Control

The idea of divine sovereignty and control over the world is the scribal thought prominently shared in Job and Deutero-Isaiah. This is not to be understood in terms of an evolutionary process leading from polytheistic ideology to monotheistic ideology; rather, the two books highlight the uniqueness of Yahweh in exercising boundless power and wisdom in the universe. In this case, how do the two writings express the idea of divine control? What are the differences with the similar ideas of 'planning' and 'determinism' in the late texts?

#### 6.1.1.1 *God's Control in Job*

In the book of Job, God intervenes in the life of a pious individual living 'in the land of Uz' (Job 1:1a) probably in Edomite territory, thus not part of the history of Israel. In the prologue, even if God seems to be swayed by the Satan's challenges, he is definitely controlling much of them by limiting the Satan's power, when allowing him to bring all the disasters to Job. God, throughout the dialogue (3:1-42:6), is described as the last authority involved in the created world, and Yahweh's power is exercised in the entire natural world, not exclusively for the benefits of humans. The main conflict between Job and his friends involves many thoughts and questions about how an individual in distress interprets incomprehensible divine actions. The discussion on the just exercise of God's power in the world shows the conflicting perceptions between Job and his friends, but what they all implicitly agree is that whatever happens, God is holding the world and human incidents under his control. Elihu, later on summarising the

common belief of the three friends, which is the same as their conventional interpretation of suffering, also assures us that God justly rules the world without partiality (34:18-20) and that God's power is then used as an instrument for punishing the unrighteous. In Job 36-37, Elihu praises God's power in nature and its greatness as an instrument of divine government in which God manifests his majesty in the universe as a teacher (36:22-23):

הַיְיָ אֵל יִשְׁגִּיב בְּכַחוֹ מִי כִמְהוּ מוֹרָה מִי־פָקֵד עָלָיו דְּרָכּוֹ וּמִי־אָמַר פְּעֹלֹת עוֹלָה  
*Behold, God is exalted in his might; who is a teacher<sup>775</sup> like him?*  
*Who has prescribed his way of behaviour for him, or who has said, 'you have done wrong?' (36:22-23)*

The universal manifestation of his power has its instructive purpose during three seasons (Job 36:23-37:24); autumn (36:26-37:4), winter (37:5-13), and summer (37:14-24). For this, Yahweh's power serves for the judgment over people; the lightning as an instrument of judgment is used to punish human misbehaviour (36:30-32).

Likewise, Job considers that God is controlling the world with mighty power. However, the divine control which Job experiences does not occur in the predictable system of retribution in which the friends surely believe, but in the irregular decisions which are beyond human expectation and regardless of human good or bad behaviour. Such a great gap between what he has known and what he is now experiencing about divine judgment is the main reason for his despair. In this reasoning, what Job thinks about his God is getting much closer to the nature of God found in Yahweh's speech. That is to say, the sovereign wisdom of Yahweh is unsearchable by any human means, because his work is incomprehensible and inscrutable (cf. Job 28). The world is not always maintained by the law of punishment for the evil and reward

---

<sup>775</sup> For the phrase מוֹרָה מִי כִמְהוּ (“who is a teacher like him”) in Job 36:22b, the MT is not in agreement with the LXX rendering, which can be translated, “who is a master like him?” LXX appears to have read the Hebrew noun מוֹרָה as δυνάστης (“ruler”, “officer”) which may represent מַרָא in Aramaic (similarly, Gray, NJPS, Dhorme, and Tur-Sinai). The LXX reading here is unnecessary, in that there are some examples of the reading מוֹרָה in the HB (cf. Job 36:22; Prov 5:13; Isa 30:20 (twice; מוֹרִיד “Your teacher”; referring to God)). See Clines, *Job 21-37*, 824; Hartley, *Job*, 473.

for the good, but God is controlling it in inconsistent and contradictory ways. Without any direct answers for human justice, Yahweh rebukes Job for obscuring God's universal design:

מי זה מחשיך עצה במלין בלי־דעת

*Who is this man who obscures design<sup>776</sup> by words without knowledge? (38:2)*

Yahweh's rebuke is about that Job does not have the understanding necessary to direct the universe along the right track and this immediately leads to the visualization of the universe, while many questions about justice which Job has persistently claimed are ignored in Yahweh's speeches. The idea of divine control appears heavily in Yahweh's speech which describes the management of the physical world (Job 38:4-38) and animal life (38:39-39:30). Yahweh's speech is not concerned with the establishment of the world order or the planning of future events, but is concerned with ruling and sustaining the world. After mentioning the grand design obscured by human knowledge, God challenges Job to take the position of the Judge instead of Him and to manage the world by his power with better intent (40:8-14). He asks a question:

האף תפר משפטי תרשיעני למען תצדק

*Will you invalidate my decision<sup>777</sup>? Will you indeed condemn me that you may be vindicated? (40:8)*

A trivial creature like Job has no power to adjust and correct worldly chaos and evil (Job 40:11-13). In this way, Yahweh's entire speech, which highlights how marvellously he controls the world, plays a significant role in rebuking Job's misunderstanding of divine design. There are

---

<sup>776</sup> The keyword עצה has the meaning of the grand 'design' of the universe or 'universal project' (cf. Job 42:3) (Clines, 1096; Jensen, 452). Scholars have provided various meanings for this term; 'counsel' as 'God's intentions for the history of nations and its people' (Terrien, 295; cf. Hartley, 490), 'providence' in human history (Pope, 250; Dhorme, 574-5), 'purpose' (Gray, 48), 'advice' (Longman III, 417). However, this term in the context is not related to God's providence or plan in the course of history nor to God's advice or counsel.

<sup>777</sup> This term משפטי can be rendered in various ways; 'my cause' (Clines), 'my justice' (Gordis, Hartley, Longman III), 'my Order' (Gray, Good), 'my judgment' (Dhorme, Pope, LXX, JPS). It is unlikely in this setting to have the meaning of legal judgment, but is simply God's 'decision' or 'intention' by which Yahweh exercises his power over the world.

five essential characteristics in which Yahweh's speech portrays the ways of the divine control over the world,<sup>778</sup> and which show the diversity of his ruling over the world.

Firstly, God skilfully controls the natural world like a planner and an architect. It is God who has established the complex structure of the world (Job 38:4-21), has operated various elements of the world (38:22-38) and has sustained the world of animals (38:39-39:30). God has continued to sustain the world by making 'morning' follow night at its appointed time (38:12). Secondly, the extraordinary power which only God possesses is highlighted. By divine decree, the foundation of the earth is laid down (38:6) and the sea water is restricted to its own place (38:8-11). By contrast, humans are portrayed as powerless beings who do not have the authority to control the created world (40:9), nor the knowledge about the beginning of the universe (38:4-7). Thirdly, ways of controlling the world are not inflexible, but are varied according to their purposes. In the animal world, God's action is not following a uniform rule, as contrasted with the human expectation, in which the reward of the good should be discriminated from the treatment of evil. God cares both for a brutal carnivore like a lion and even birds, such as a raven (38:39-41) and gives autonomy to undomesticated and untamed animals such as a mountain goat, a wild ass, and a wild ox (39:1-12). Their inherent characteristics are entirely different according to divine preference; such as a foolish ostrich, a courageous war horse, and a wise hawk/vulture (39:13-30).

Fourthly, although man is the primary object to which the divine council paid attention in the prologue and God seems to speak to Job in Yahweh's speeches, surprisingly we cannot find any description of humans in Yahweh's cosmos. Its literary purpose is to depict Yahweh as being absorbed in his own glory in the world.<sup>779</sup> In it, there is no mention of human suffering and

---

<sup>778</sup> I referred to ten significant reflections in Yahweh's speeches from David J. A. Clines, *Job 38-42*, WBC 18B (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2011), 1089–91.

<sup>779</sup> This contrasts with the issue of Genesis in creation in which the world is made for the sake of humans, but in Job the world has no association with humans. It is a place where the divine power and beauty are revealed.

injustice in the world, and no attempt to defend the accusation of injustice raised in the dialogue. This is noticeably stated in the description of two beasts in Job 40-41, which are the most precious and valuable creatures on earth (40:19), and humans at some points are described as the least valued, not as the head of all creatures (cf. Gen 1:26-29). Fifthly, in its description, the world does not seem to have any problem and disorder through external chaos, since God perfectly forces every element in the world to function in a proper way. God does not need to rectify injustice and to mend his world. Everything in the universe is in its own place; nothing is out of its original setting so that the world goes well. Under the faultless control of God, the created world is what brings joy to its Creator and is the object of divine attention and praise (39:5-8, 9-12, 19-25; 40:16, 19; 41:12).

#### 6.1.1.2 *God's Control in Deutero-Isaiah*

In Deutero-Isaiah, Yahweh is depicted as the Sovereign One acting vigorously in and beyond Israelite events and able to control effectively worldly affairs, regardless of human errors and unfaithfulness (Isa 40:9-11). With the long-standing national suffering, God appears already to have acted beyond human expectation:

מגיד מראשית אחרית ומקדם אשר לא־נעשו אמר עצתי תקום וכל־חפצי אעשה  
*Declaring the outcome<sup>780</sup> from the beginning and things which are not done  
 from the ancient time and saying, "My counsel will stand and I<sup>781</sup> will do all my  
 desire" (Isa 46:10)*

Although Israelites have repeatedly failed to understand God's concrete purposes in the conflict of international politics (Isa 44:26) and in the darkness of God's hiddenness (40:27; 45:15), the nature of God is certainly seen to be acting in the punishment and reward of Israel and foreign nations. Then, the texts do not seem to state that God has a plan of human history which outlines the course of humanity moment by moment, but that God's power is responding to

---

<sup>780</sup> LXX renders אחרית into τὰ ἔσχατα ('the last things').

<sup>781</sup> 1QIsa renders this in the third person, "he" which probably refers to Cyrus. Two versions 1QIsb and 4QIsa supports MT "I". Goldingay, *Isaiah vol.2*, 83.

human behaviour in the world. In a series of human events, Israel as a servant of Yahweh will play a divinely appointed role for nations and will be ultimately rewarded and restored. God has many purposes and intentions to change the world which are not revealed to human understanding. Let us consider this in detail.

Regarding the first finding, God controls the natural world (Isa 45:12, 18) and directly intervenes in it by transforming the existing natural order (40:3-4). There God is portrayed as the creator and builder of the world (40:22; 42:5; 44:24; 45:12; 48:13; 51:13, 16; cf. Job 26).<sup>782</sup> But, the emphasis is not on the creation of the world, but on the Creator who does what he desires to do in the created world. On the one hand, Yahweh, for the purpose of presenting the singleness of Israel's God among all other gods (41:20), transforms nature and when the poor and the needy thirst, he purposefully acts by watering the desert and planting trees (41:17-20). On the other hand, God works in a violent and destructive way upon the created world by reversing the natural order (42:15; 44:27). Thus, God's intervention is expressed in two ways in nature, either by extending prosperity, blessing, and goodness or by bringing destruction, disaster, and evil (45:7). Chaotic power and all the evil forces are prominently employed for divine purposes (50:2b; 51:9-10) for which God will make a way and even wild animals ultimately will 'honour' Yahweh in response to the reconstruction of nature (43:19a-20). This is not occurring as the response to the behaviour of people, but results from the act of divine sovereignty and self-determination (41:17; 45:7-8; cf. 42:5; 44:24).

For the second finding, God controls the Israelite community either by judging their iniquities or by bringing about security and safety (Isa 45:7-8). The present suffering of Jacob-Israel in exile was the consequence of failing to understand divine lessons and purpose (40:21-31; 42:23-25) in the running of the world. But regardless of Jacob-Israel's blindness and deafness, which lead them into punishment (42:18-21), God continues to challenge them to listen to Him,

---

<sup>782</sup> See Habel, "He Who Stretches out the Heavens."

in order to make them recognise his divine intentions (42:25; cf. 51:1-8, 21). God controls the ways of the Israelite community in three ways; by giving them deliverance and security from political bondage, by commissioning them for the nations as a servant of God, and by making Yahweh's servant carry undeserved suffering. Firstly, regardless of their disqualification, Yahweh's deliverance for Israel's security (43:1-5) and liberation from political bondage (43:6) will be given to Israel.<sup>783</sup> The deliverance is totally dependent upon God's purpose in which Yahweh seems to have absolute authority over Israel. Secondly, Israel, even though she sinned against her God, still belongs to Yahweh as his servant and witness (44:21), and this will play an important role in bringing nations to their God (43:8-13; cf. 44:8-9). This is an unexpected response to human deeds because, even though the Israelites seem hopeless in failing to keep the covenant, Yahweh will continue to entrust the Israelites with the full privileges of witnessing among nations that the God of Israel is the one true deity (43:10-13). Lastly, God controls his agent through the undeserved suffering of Yahweh's servant whose hidden purpose is unknown to people, but which is used for the benefits of the many as an instrument of restoration (52:13-53:12).

The third finding is that God controls foreign nations and their rulers. God in Isa 40:12-26 declares the nothingness of nations (40:15-17) and the incomparability of Yahweh compared to foreign idols (40:18-20; cf. 44:9-20). All the idol-worshippers and their associations will finally slip away (44:11) and God will make false prophets, diviners, and sages of foreign nations become frustrated and foolish (44:25). Deutero-Isaiah notices the uselessness of Babylonian gods and images such as Bel and Nebo, which would mean the decline of the empire and its kings behind them (46:1-2). In particular, Cyrus the Persian king is portrayed as being controlled by the God of Israel as Yahweh's anointed agent and 'shepherd' (44:28; 45:1), to fulfil God's desire (44:26). He is the divine representative who executes God's purpose by

---

<sup>783</sup> The passage 43:1-7 begins with the conjunction ועתה ('but now') which announce the new division from the former speech concerning Israelite's sin, blindness.

military actions which will lead to the defeat of the Babylonian Empire (45:2-3).<sup>784</sup> This notion of the divine election of a gentile ruler is a new way in which God controls the history of Israel. Like the figure of Job, King Cyrus cannot recognise the divine hand behind all these events (45:4b). Furthermore, the purpose of calling Cyrus as a divine agent is for the sake of the universal acknowledgment of all the people (45:5a, 6) who will worship Yahweh as the ultimate controller and Creator of the universe. (45:7-8; cf. 40:13; 44:25-28; 55:8-9).

### 6.1.1.3 Plan and Determinism

The notion of God's control in Job and Deutero-Isaiah might be considered as having similarities with ideas such as God's 'plan' and the 'determinism' found in the late Persian and Hellenistic periods. Do the two books then include those late ideas? Or, could these ideas be regarded as identical concepts to those of God's control? At first, what God is supposed to do in the world is likely to be related to the concept of the 'plan' of the future history. Scholars, who have discussed the concept of 'Salvation History' or 'the saving action' of God in the Hebrew Bible, have in general argued that there is a universal fixed plan for the Israelites and for world history,<sup>785</sup> i.e., Gerhard von Rad says:

*In this connexion, the present-day reader is well advised to lay aside all ideas of a general guidance of history by divine providence; for when Isaiah speaks of "purpose," he is thinking of something planned for the deliverance of Zion, that is to say, of saving work. Isaiah sets this saving act of Jahweh in the widest possible historical context, namely that of universal history.*<sup>786</sup>

---

<sup>784</sup> Conrad argued that עצה/יָעַץ is used for revealing Yahweh's military strategy for all the nations. Edgar W. Conrad, *Reading Isaiah*, OBT 27 (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 52–82.

<sup>785</sup> For the summary of discussion of "divine plans" in the ancient Near East, see Robert Karl Gnuse, *Heilsgeschichte as a Model for Biblical Theology: The Debate Concerning the Uniqueness and Significance of Israel's Worldview*, CTSSR 4 (Lanham, MD; London: UP of America, 1989), 59–62; Johannes Fichtner, "Jahves Plan in Der Botschaft Des Jesaja," *ZAW* 63, no. 1-2 (1951): 16–33; Joseph Jensen, "Yahweh's Plan in Isaiah and in the Rest of the Old Testament," *CBQ* 48, no. 3 (1986): 443–55; Walter Brueggemann, "Planned People/Planned Book," in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 19–37.

<sup>786</sup> Gerhard Von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, trans. D. M. G. Stalker, 2 (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1965), 162.



It could probably be said that divine purpose in the Hebrew Bible usually implies a wide and forward-looking vision in a series of goals, but it is hard to assume that all the biblical books present an unmovable and fixed ‘Plan’ in history. For instance, Bertil Albrektson investigates the nuance of God’s definite plan(s) in history which many biblical scholars (e.g., Lindblom, Cullmann, Fichtner, Jensen, etc.) have suggested in the Hebrew Bible.<sup>787</sup> He argues that although there are many Hebrew terms and expressions related to God’s ‘plan’ in prophetic books and Psalms (Isa 5:19; 14:26; Mic 4:12; Jer 23:20; 25:1; 30:24; 49:20; 50:45; 51:11, 29), those words ‘may come very close to meaning “purpose, intention”’ and ‘do not have a pregnant or a more precise meaning, but are fairly vague and wide terms.’<sup>788</sup> He concludes:

*Now there is of course a great difference between a plan in a limited sequence of occurrences and a plan in History with capital H: the view that Yhwh acts purposefully in what happens is not necessarily identical with the idea that history as a whole is heading for a definite goal along a road laid out according to a fixed plan.*<sup>789</sup>

God in the Hebrew Bible of course explicitly declares several purposes from the creation of the world to the divine election of Israel and the establishment of the covenant with her; however, they do not refer to a predetermined plan. Divine actions need to be understood as purposeful acts of Yahweh in a series of events which have different smaller aims, even if there is an exception such as the book of Daniel which is supposed to have a fixed plan in history.<sup>790</sup>

Walter Brueggemann also rejects the undefined idea of ‘plan’ in Isaiah and takes a much weaker notion of purpose or intention.<sup>791</sup> He maintains that God’s plan ‘is one side of a dialectic, and that is why the term עצה cannot be stated flatly as a grand design’.<sup>792</sup> He then

---

<sup>787</sup> See Bertil Albrektson, *History and the Gods: An Essay on the Idea of Historical Events as Divine Manifestations in the Ancient Near East and in Israel*, CB 1 (Lund: Gleerup, 1967), 68–97.

<sup>788</sup> Ibid., 76–7.

<sup>789</sup> Ibid., 87.

<sup>790</sup> Ibid., 88–9.

<sup>791</sup> Brueggemann, “Planned,” 21–2, 24; also see Fichtner, “Jahves,” 42.

<sup>792</sup> Brueggemann, “Planned,” 27.

observes that ‘there is no external design that is all foreseen, ahead of time’ and the book of Isaiah ‘offers rhetoric, not metaphysics.’<sup>793</sup>

As for our present interest in the ‘divine plan’, the question is whether God in Job and Deutero-Isaiah has a long-term plan for the world or not; namely, ‘Is he ruling the world for a particular end or result?’ or ‘is he merely controlling it or responding to a series of events?’ Strictly speaking, in the book of Job, there are no texts which state a planning of future events in history, not least in the prose-tale of Job, where we read of God’s sudden response to the Satan’s challenge and where God allows him to act in a way that is different from what was originally intended (Job 1-2). In other words, God takes an action, because he had an idea when being challenged by the Satan, who suggests the new proposal of testing Job’s piety. Then, God in Yahweh’s speech (Job 38-41) appears as the One running the cosmic world, not as a deity who makes a future plan. Yahweh, from the beginning of his speeches, is not taking issue with future plans and nowhere does Yahweh speak of plans or a grand plan of world history, but the description is intended to portray Yahweh himself. Accordingly, human incidents described in the book of Job are far from a predestined plan with fixed stages.

On the other hand, in Deutero-Isaiah, the lack of the concept of planning the future is implied less clearly than in the texts of Job. In some ways, Yahweh could be seen as having a plan in which Israel becomes Yahweh’s servant, in order that all the nations ultimately take part in the Israelites’ community to know, serve, and worship Him altogether (Isa 45:23b; 49:26b).

Nonetheless, this does not mean that Deutero-Isaiah is adopting the concept of an immovable and unchangeable plan. The fact that Israel has been punished in God’s response to their disobedience and even has been overpunished by divine wrath suggests that Israel is acting outside the predetermined plan and that punishment comes upon her as a divine reaction, not as a proactive deed (Isa 42:24-25; 50:1). If there is any association with the divine plan for the

---

<sup>793</sup> Ibid., 36.

future, that is to emerge from divine reactions to human virtue and vice, not from the output of an automated and mechanical programme by God. In general, this can be seen in other prophetic books such as the book of Jonah, which highlights the fact that God, in response to human action, makes some modifications to his original plan. This is the general concept indicated in prophetic literature, since, if God's planning in no way changes, all these concepts concerning human repentance and God's retribution would be pointless. A wisdom book such as Ecclesiastes could be considered as being interested in divine planning, but it is incorrect to believe that God sets a particular direction for the destiny of the universe in any books of wisdom literature.

Another point to be considered is the concept of 'determinism' which is quite similar to the notion of 'planning'.<sup>794</sup> Can we consider the divine control in Israelite thought to be 'determinism' which means that all human actions are ultimately controlled only by external power or by divine decisions regardless of human freewill? Some would argue that we can see this idea of determinism in texts from biblical history such as the Joseph story (Gen 37-50), the Succession Narrative (2 Sam 9-24 and 1 Kgs 1-2), from the wisdom literature such as Ecclesiastes and Proverbs, and from prophetic books. But, it is doubtful that the Hebrew Bible in general develops such a deterministic idea.

Let us start by looking at Joseph's story. Joseph is sold to traders and works in Egypt as a result of his brothers' wicked conspiracy, and it is interpreted later that all of the events effectively function as no more than part of the divine plan (Gen 45:5b, 7a, 8a; 50:20). However, it is probably unlikely that all the events within Joseph's story happened in an arranged scheme. All that we can observe from the texts is that God takes control of Joseph's life, and transposes evil

---

<sup>794</sup> Rudman defines it as "the belief that human thought, action, and feeling is, to a greater or lesser extent, controlled by a greater power and that human beings have little or no free will of their own". Refer to Dominic Rudman, "Determinism and Anti-Determinism in the Book of Koheleth," *JBQ* 30, no. 2 (2002): 97.

acts into good for his purpose in various ways. In the Succession Narrative, likewise, because of David's crime, divine punishment comes upon his household (2 Sam 12:10-11), but apparently it is not brought about by predestined plan in which God has to punish David and his household. A series of misfortunes is initiated by David who acts against God, so that God simply changes his mind and consequently responds to his misbehaviour. In Ecclesiastes and Proverbs, it could be argued that the deterministic idea appears in the actions and reactions between individuals and God, although it is hard to assess how rigid this determinism is.<sup>795</sup> However, it is difficult to conclude that God's actions in those books only follow deterministic ways, since we discover in them many important ideas of divine judgment according to human deeds. For instance, Weeks talks about the difficulty in understanding Ecclesiastes' concepts of determinism and free will, and argues that 'although a perception of determinism in the book was certainly a problem for some later commentators, the practical implications of any such determinism are limited so long as Ecclesiastes continues to assert also the reality of divine judgment and the independence of human motives.'<sup>796</sup> Furthermore, the prophetic books in general seem to indicate a deterministic concept in passages which are associated with the last and eschatological judgment on Israel and Judah. Yet, it does not mean that there is no sense of real and immediate punishment on human wrongdoings and throughout the history of Israel; it is basically observed that the divine act as a response to human misconduct is so characterized by the language of judging nations and Israel. In the same way, although Job and Deutero-Isaiah evince a strong idea of divine sovereignty over the creature and the human history, a set of events in the action and reaction between human and God is not the unavoidable product of foregoing causes given by God.

---

<sup>795</sup> Refer to Prov 16:1, 4 and Eccl 9:7. See Dominic Rudman, *Determinism in the Book of Ecclesiastes*, JSOTSup (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001); Stuart Weeks, *Ecclesiastes and Scepticism* (NY: T&T Clark, 2012), 152–9.

<sup>796</sup> See Weeks, *Scepticism*, 159.

Consequently, the deterministic idea generally linked to Greek philosophical teachings in the Hellenistic period<sup>797</sup> is not the same as that found in the two books and the scribal idea of the divine control is quite dissimilar with these late notions of ‘planning’ and ‘determinism’.

### 6.1.2 God’s Freedom

Such an understanding of divine action in the world leads us to raise another issue about God’s responsibility for human suffering. Questions that we ask are what makes Yahweh determine to judge and restore Israel in Deutero-Isaiah, what causes sufferings to a pious individual in the book of Job, and why then is God so different from the general portrayal of God who always responds beneficently to human piety and to devout prayer? All the relevant questions, which we should suppose in this section, are related to the motive for divine actions: ‘Does God have the responsibility to help humans who are suffering to eradicate evil in the world?’ and ‘does God have to intervene in human affairs?’ These questions necessarily call for re-examining the divine nature in the light of God’s dealing with human beings and for considering whether these reveal any limitation in his nature or actions. The relationship between God and humans in the two books is definitely described in the idea of God free from any human laws, not in the framework of the Deuteronomic theology or the retribution principles.

#### 6.1.2.1 *God’s Freedom in Job*

What Yahweh’s speech in the book of Job achieves through poetic expression is the announcement of divine freedom. The description of the animals’ world (Job 38:39-39:3) suggests that humans cannot domesticate and tame the wild animals (lion, mountain goats, wild ass, wild ox, ostrich, war horse, hawk, vulture, etc), but Yahweh, without any other being involved, can master them. Those creatures do not have to depend on any help from humans and their deepest need cannot be satisfied by humans (38:39). They do not serve for human

---

<sup>797</sup> Rudman, “Anti-Determinism,” 79.

business (39:9-12), and live by divinely-given rules and by their animal nature, not by man-made principles.<sup>798</sup> References to all the animals mentioned in this scene aim to highlight their freedom which humans are unable to limit. While God is asking whether Job has the ability to control the world and its creatures, the issue of judgment which Job raised—the suffering of the righteous and the well-being of the wicked—is not on the table. The portrait of the beauty of two beasts, Behemoth and Leviathan in Yahweh’s second speech (40:15-41:26 [Eng. 40:15-41:34]), although, as God’s masterpiece, they are far more overwhelming in appearance and more bizarre in behaviour than other animals, has the same literary goal as that of the wild animals in the first speech. The emphasis on Yahweh’s universal rule and freedom using the independence and aggressiveness of wild creatures as illustration (38:39, 41; 39:5-8, 9-12) is repeated and expanded in Yahweh’s second speech.

Scholars have interpreted the monstrous figures in this text from two different angles; mythological monsters or real animals;<sup>799</sup> in a nutshell, what we need to carefully discern is that the poetic expressions have imageries both as mythological beings and as earthly creatures. The author of Job picks up these literary figures as significant in order to present the idea of divine freedom in the relationship between man and God. Let us see how the two beasts are portrayed. Firstly, a glorious, but fearful appearance and character exists in them. Yahweh introduces and praises the two beasts, which are not the enemies of God, but the greatest masterpiece of God (cf. Job 40:15, 19b; 41:10-11). Behemoth is portrayed as the best creature of God’s works (‘the first of the ways of God’ in 40:19a), while Leviathan is described as the fearless one and ‘the ruler over all the kings’ (41:33-34). In particular, Leviathan is described as the most complete and glorious creatures which are self-confident, self-governing, and self-sufficient; in contrast, humans are portrayed as thoroughly alienated from the world of beasts. Secondly, these

---

<sup>798</sup> God’s ways for caring for wild animals (lion, raven, mountain goat, wild ass, wild ox, ostrich, war horse, hawk, and vulture) show a colourful mode of existence (38:39-41; 39:29-30).

<sup>799</sup> Clines, *Job 38-42*, 1183–6, 1190–2.

particular beasts are not controlled nor tamed by humans (40:24; 41:1-9). They have too much incredible strength and extraordinary physical bodies (40:15c-18; 41:12-24) and furthermore, they are so wild, disruptive, and arbitrary in physical strength and behaviour. Even though humans might utilise all their weapons to subdue them and fishing techniques to capture them, all these efforts would be useless. It is too risky to attempt to approach and subdue them. It is so dangerous for humans to hunt (41:1-2, 7), enslave (41:4), entertain (41:5), and trade (41:6) Leviathan, since they are living in a different habitat with different rules (41:1-11). The supposition that humans can hunt them and can reach any formal relationship with these beasts is no more than an illusion. Beasts are not subordinate to the human world, but they are not targets of transaction and negotiation and must be segregated from humans (41:10-11).

Now, in given texts, the beauty of the two beasts may be viewed as reflecting God's nature. The writer of Yahweh's second speech significantly portrays the nature of divine freedom by describing the characteristics of the beasts in relation to humans. Firstly, just as humans cannot control the two beasts, Yahweh cannot be controlled by humans (Job 41:4, 7-9), so how ridiculous are humans' attempts to manipulate God and to resist him:

לֹא־אֶכְזֹר כִּי יַעֲוִרֵנוּ וּמִי הוּא לִפְנֵי יִתְצַב מִי הַקְּדִימָנִי וְאֶשְׁלֵם תַּחַת כָּל־הַשָּׁמַיִם לִי־הוּא  
*There is none so bold as to rouse it, who is the man who can stand before  
it<sup>800</sup>? Who has confronted it and survived<sup>801</sup>? None under the whole heaven!  
(41:2-3; [Eng. 41:10-11])*

---

<sup>800</sup> The second half of 41:2 has some difficulties in translation. Some mss reads it as the third person ('before it') while MT reads it as the first person singular. If we read the prepositional phrase as לִפְנֵי, 'before me' (Hartley, Good, Driver-Gray, Tur-Sinai; LXX, JPS, RSV, NIV, ESV), it will highlight God's outstanding power. Otherwise, if we see it as לִפְנֵי, 'before it' which refers to Leviathan, rather than a person, it will highlight the exceeding power of the monster (Dhorme, Pope, Gordis, Gray, Clines, Terrien, Longman III; NRSV, NAB). In the present context, the reference to God is unlikely to be reasonable, because it emphasises the meaninglessness of the human attempt to seize Leviathan and the entire description is about Leviathan's grotesque characteristics; of course, whether adopting either interpretation, it accents that no one can encroach on the divine realm.

<sup>801</sup> Many prefer the emendation וַיִּשְׁלֵם which means "and come out safe", or "and remained safe" (Gray, Clines, NRSV) than the reading וְאֶשְׁלֵם (piel וַיִּשְׁלֵם; "and I repay or requite") (Hartley, Good, ESV, RSV, JPS). I adopted the rendering וַיִּשְׁלֵם. See Clines, *Job 38-42*, 1162.

Just as the two beasts are self-centred and self-confident, and are totally disparate breeds living in a different world, apart from humans,<sup>802</sup> the God of Job cannot coexist with humans nor can he be relegated to the area of humans.

Secondly, Yahweh, as a result, is not restrained by human rules or obligations, and humans cannot impose human justice on God (Job 41:1, 10-11). Interestingly, in the description of beasts, God asks Job about the possibility of imposing responsibilities on Leviathan, as required in the obligatory relation:

היכרת ברית עמך תקחנו לעבד עולם

*Will he make a contract with you to be taken as your perpetual slave? (40:28; [Eng. 41:4])*

Indeed, Job has no ability to exercise control over monstrous animals and to subdue them like domestic animals. Leviathan is seen as the representative of an animal that is not capable of being tamed or disciplined. It is not a controllable beast, but the object of praise. In the same way, the Creator God is not influenced, nor cajoled, by human intercession. In this sense, Yahweh in Job is presented as completely independent and free from any human restraints. God cannot be appropriated for human benefits and human wisdom cannot be used to negotiate with God. If humans can restrain God by some means and if God loses the right to do what God wants, Yahweh might be a god enslaved to human regulations and justice. But, the God of the Israelites is too untamed and uncontrollable to be forced into making a contract or fulfilling any responsibility to humans. In this aspect, God has no responsibility to respond to Job's questions about human suffering or to be obliged to execute the justice which Job and his friends called for. Therefore, Yahweh's challenge to consider two bizarre beasts is closely associated with the divine sovereignty to do what God desires.

In the epilogue, Yahweh simply rejects the traditional view which Job's friends claimed about an interrelationship between human suffering and divine punishment, and he even responds

---

<sup>802</sup> Ibid., 1192.



with fury and anger toward the friends, because they witnessed to what are not confirmed and settled<sup>803</sup> by themselves (Job 42:7-8). On the contrary, Job's empirical knowledge about divine nature, that Yahweh is free from human rules and justice, and about divine action, that suffering is not always related to the problem of divine punishment and reward, is favoured and confirmed by God.

#### 6.1.2.2 *God's Freedom in Deutero-Isaiah*

In what ways is the God of Israel in Deutero-Isaiah free from all restraints and rules? Does God have any responsibilities for the deliverance of his elected people? The exiled community addressed by Deutero-Isaiah seems to believe that Yahweh has forsaken them and that the political and religious powers of Babylon and Persia are even more powerful than the God of Israel. Because of the national disaster, the text then seems to pose the question about the traditional belief of the God of Israel: 'Is there Yahweh who is beyond the power of the Babylonian gods?'; 'In what ways is their God different?'; 'Does Yahweh still act in the sphere of the Mosaic and Deuteronomic covenants?' If the old covenants are not still effectual in the relationship with God, to which different rules does God work in the world? This is the individual theology of Deutero-Isaiah which is different from that of other prophetic texts. The God of Israel will begin to work with the new rule in the course of world history (Isa 48:6-11) where God's wrath will be transformed into forgiveness and God's punishment into blessing (43:25; 48:9). Deutero-Isaiah declares God's freedom from all the human rules and impositions to act. God's independence from any human impositions can be summarised in three aspects: in the new covenantal relationship, in the unconditional deliverance of Israel, and in the universalistic concern for all the nations.

---

<sup>803</sup> The Hebrew word נִכְוֶנֶה is much closer to the rendering of "what is established" or "what is confirmed" (cf. Gen 41:32) than is used for "what is right" in the sense of "the truth" (KJV, ESV, TNK, Clines). See Stuart Weeks, *An Introduction to the Study of Wisdom Literature* (London: T&T Clark, 2010), 67.

Firstly, Yahweh is free from covenantal relationships that require two-sided obligations (Isa 42:6; 49:8; 54:10; 55:3; cf. Jer 31:31-34; Ezek 34:34-37). The relationship between man and God in Deutero-Isaiah is different from the Mosaic covenant typically presented in Exodus and Deuteronomy, which requires obligations on both parties (Exod 19:5-6; 23:20-24:3-8; Deut 7:12-26; 28:1-69); it is to some extent undisputed that Moses' covenant is bound up with a law code imposed by Yahweh on Israelites and this requires the oath of the God of Israel to keep them secure (Deut 29:11-12).<sup>804</sup> In the broken relationship between Israel and God, the old rules, which Israelites have known and learnt through the Mosaic covenant, cannot influence the independent decision of God any more. In this sense, the Mosaic covenant in Deutero-Isaiah would no longer work, and there are no grounds why God should follow the old rules which undermine divine freedom.

References in Isa 55:1-5 might recall and reaffirm the prophet appeals to the Davidic covenant.<sup>805</sup> The Davidic covenant is likely to be continued in history and is assumed in all generations in that Deutero-Isaiah refers to the expression of the eternal covenant of David; ברית עולם חסדי דוד הנאמנים 'an eternal covenant, the faithful mercies to David' (Isa 55:3b). However, there is no explicit indication here that Yahweh's intervention is for the sake of the Davidic royal family, and the covenant with the Davidic descendants is not a major theological issue, but is for all the nations who respond to Yahweh's calling (Isa 55:1). God's new relationship with humans (לכם; 'with you') in v. 3b does not count on Jacob-Israel's deeds and obedience, but on God's sovereign decision. Yahweh's invitation to his banquet providing free 'wine' and free 'milk' sets up the new lifestyle, and it definitely is unconditional and is not

---

<sup>804</sup> Frank H. Polak, "The Covenant at Mount Sinai in the Light of Texts from Mari," in *Sefer Moshe: The Moshe Weinfeld Jubilee Volume: Studies in the Bible and the Ancient Near East, Qumran, and Post-Biblical Judaism*, ed. Chaim Cohen, Avi Hurvitz, and Shalom M. Paul (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2004), 119–34, notices the "bilocal ratification" processes in the narrative of the Sinai covenant (Exod 24:4-8, 9-11).

<sup>805</sup> Brueggemann, "Isaiah 55 and Deuteronomical Theology"; *Isaiah 40-66*, Westminster Bible Companion (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1998), 159; Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 40-55*, 51–4, 369–70.

dependent on the faithful commitment of humans. Of course, Deutero-Isaiah urges them to ‘seek the Lord’ and to ‘call upon him’ abandoning human plans and ways and turning to God (55:6-7b). But, the foundation of divine compassion and forgiveness does not count on their faithful reaction to or disloyal breach of any covenant, but on what they have been given (55:7c).<sup>806</sup> God’s purposes are thought to contrast with human ideas, and God’s sovereignty is not to be understood by human faculties:

כי לא מחשבתי מחשבותיכם ולא דרכיכם דרכי נאם יהוה כי גבהו שמים מארץ כן  
גבהו דרכי מדרכיכם ומחשבתי ממחשבותיכם  
*For my thoughts are not your thoughts, nor are your ways my ways, declares  
Yahweh. For the heavens are high above the earth, so are my ways higher than  
your ways and my thoughts than your thoughts. (Isa 55:8-9)*

In fact, God’s sovereign acting for his people in the preceding Isa 54:1-17 is already described in the feminine imagery of an abandoned woman or city, presumably Zion;<sup>807</sup> Yahweh will be her husband, calling, gathering, and reshaping Zion (54:1-8). He declares the new promises and the unshakable ‘covenant of peace’ to a hopeless infertile woman (54:10b; cf. 54:1). Her shame and disgrace which were momentary is contrasted to the vastness of divine mercies (54:7) and Yahweh’s anger and abandonment will immediately be replaced by eternal commitment, ובחסד עולם (54:8).

ברגע קטן עזבתיך וברחמים גדלים אקבצך בשצף בשצף קצף חסתרתי פני רגע ממך  
ובחסד עולם רחמתיך אמר גאלך יהוה כימי נח זאת לי אשר נשבעתי מעבר מי־נח  
עוד עלי־הארץ כן נשבעתי מקצף עליך ומגער־בך כי ההרים ימושו והגבעות תמוטנה  
וחסדי מאתך לא־ימושו וברית שלומי לא תמוט אמר מרחמך יהוה  
*For a little moment, I forsook you, but with great compassion, I will gather you.  
In flooding of wrath, I hid my face from you for a moment, and with everlasting  
commitment, I will have compassion on you, your Redeemer Yahweh says. For  
this is the waters of Noah to me; as I swore that Noah’s waters should not pass  
over the earth again, so I have sworn that I will not be angry with you and  
rebuke you. For the mountains may depart and the hills may totter, but my  
commitment will not depart from you, and my covenant of peace shall not totter,  
Yahweh, who has compassion on you, says. (Isa 54:7-10)*

<sup>806</sup> See Goldingay, *Message*, 552–3.

<sup>807</sup> John F. A. Sawyer, “Daughter of Zion and Servant of the Lord in Isaiah: A Comparison,” *JSOT*, no. 44 (1989): 89–107.

The reference to מֵי־נֹחַ ('the waters of Noah') in Isa 54:9-10 is not intended to relate to the confirmation of the Noahic covenant, but the covenant in Deutero-Isaiah involves the new action by Yahweh which has not been seen in previous relations between God and Israel. This is to emphasise the eternity of the new covenant and the assurance of blessing and prosperity for the sake of Zion, and is to underline the irrelevance of human disloyalty to impositions and laws.

Secondly, Yahweh is free to act in Israel's deliverance. Will God deliver his people, even though Jacob-Israel continually breaks the relationship with God? The answer in Deutero-Isaiah is enough to say 'yes'. However, God's deliverance of his people is not reserved in the past remembrance of the Exodus from Egypt—אֶל־תִּזְכְּרוּ רֵאשִׁוֹנוֹת וְקִדְמֹנִיּוֹת אֶל־תִּתְּבֹנְנוּ ('Do not remember the former things, nor consider the ancient things') in Isa 43:18—and indeed Yahweh further declares the new salvific action already started (42:9; 43:19a). It is significant to recognise that even if the exiled community was still anticipating the former mechanism of deliverance, Deutero-Isaiah commands them to forget 'the former things' and declares 'the latter things' (48:3-11). Divine verdicts upon human behaviour are so inconsistent and arbitrary (48:8-9) that they frustrate human prediction for their security (48:6-11; cf. 41:22-23). Further, although God has foreseen that Israel will break the relationship, God declares that His judgment against Jacob-Israel's rebellion will be deferred because of his own glory:

כִּי יָדַעְתִּי בְּגֹד תִּבְגֹּד וּפֶשַׁע מִבֶּטֶן קָרָא לְךָ לְמַעַן שְׁמִי אֶאֱרִיךְ אֲפִי וְתִהְיֶה אַחֲטָם־לְךָ לְבִלְתִּי הַכְרִיתֶךָ

*For I knew that you would keep breaking faith,<sup>808</sup> and a rebel from the womb you have been called. For my name's sake, I will defer my anger, for the sake of my praise, I restrain it for you, that I may not cut you off. (Isa 48:8b-9)*

---

<sup>808</sup> The doubling of the verb בָּגַד (qal infinitive abs; qal imperfect 2ms) which is translated as "treat faithlessly", "commit faithlessness" (BDB) emphasises the unfaithful Israel which continually kept breaking the relationship with Yahweh. This reading is adopted here. See Goldingay, *Isaiah vol.2*, 131–2.

Yahweh runs the world in a new way, as a potter has freedom to make what kinds of pots he wants to produce (Isa 45:9-10; 48:3-5). So, although they failed in keeping God's laws and covenant, God's free act apart from any rule will forgive their sins and restore his people (42:18-43:21; cf. 43:25).

Thirdly, the divine freedom in Deutero-Isaiah is suggested in 'universalism', not in 'localism'.<sup>809</sup> Yahweh is portrayed not as a local deity committed to a particular group, but as the cosmic God for everyone (Isa 45:22-25). As the provision and deliverance Yahweh will grant are for the sake of all the nations on the earth, people are invited to trust Yahweh, so that they will perceive his power as their deliverer and will worship Him (45:22). Of course, Israel, having a distinct role among all the nations, will last. However, the divine purpose in Deutero-Isaiah is not limited to an ethnic and geographical sphere, but is expanded to the cosmic community of those who follow and trust Yahweh (45:24a). In fact, from the beginning of Isa 40, it has already been announced that Yahweh's glory will be revealed to 'all flesh' (Isa 40:5). Yahweh's new action for all the people is exemplified in the mission of Yahweh's servant Israel where it becomes 'a light for the nations' (49:6) and 'a covenant for the people' (49:8; 42:6). Yahweh's justice and righteousness are for the new community who will listen to Yahweh's message (51:4-6, 22), not only for Jacob-Israel.

### 6.1.2.3 *Mosaic Covenant*

Let us evaluate the idea of divine freedom in Job and Deutero-Isaiah compared with the context of the Mosaic (or Deuteronomic) covenant (cf. Exod 19:5-6; Deut 28:1-14), in which God would behave in a set of 'imposition', 'liability', and 'obligation'. The primary concern of the Jewish community during the exilic and post-exilic period under the oppression of foreign

---

<sup>809</sup> Julian Morgenstern, "Deutero-Isaiah's Terminology for 'Universal God,'" *JBL* 62, no. 4 (1943): 269–80; Robert Davidson, "Universalism in Second Isaiah," *SJT* 16, no. 02 (1963): 166–85; Joel S. Kaminsky and Anne Stewart, "God of All the World: Universalism and Developing Monotheism in Isaiah 40-66," *HTR* 99, no. 2 (2006): 139–63.

nations was whether the covenants which God made with the forefathers of Israel were still in operation or were annulled. The tradition of Mosaic covenant was generally perceived in the framework in which all suffering usually results from individual and communal misbehaviour and in which, whenever they return to their deity in the midst of God's wrath, God will restore the breached relationship; it is common in the Deuteronomistic history that the national restoration of Israel comes possibly by human obedience to the Torah based on the covenantal thought, and there are significant parts of prophetic books which adopt heavily the ancient idea of Mosaic covenant (cf. Jer 29:11-12). In this regard, it may be accepted that this covenantal theology drawn from the deuteronomistic texts is significantly adopted in Job and Deutero-Isaiah.<sup>810</sup> Of course, both writers might be aware of the general notion of the Hebrew covenant or of a general royal treaty in the ancient Near East, but they are unlikely to intend to sustain the orthodox view of covenant. In fact, in these two books, the concept of the Mosaic covenant is considerably weakened and appears as being more feeble than that in other biblical books. The deficiency of the idea of Israel's covenant is all the more apparent, when considering that there is little assured reference to the covenantal connection in either book. The Hebrew word ברית is rare in the two texts, though there are a few examples—in Job 5:23; 31:1; 40:28; Isa 42:6, 49:8 (לברית עם, 'a covenant for the people'), 54:10, 55:3; a possible term associated with 'covenant', חסד in Job 6:14; 10:12; 37:13; Isa 40:6; 54:8, 10; 55:3.

Firstly, the idea of 'covenant' in the book of Job may be questioned. According to Max Rogland, Job's text has the notion of the covenantal bond between God and Job from three elements; (1) languages of legal proceeding (Job 23:4; 13:8; 31:35); (2) Job's oath (Job 31:5-8); (3) the descriptions of Job's 'blamelessness' (1:8; 2:3) and of blessings and curses in the reference with Deut 28.<sup>811</sup> However, though there is an amount of linguistic overlapping with

---

<sup>810</sup> For the association with covenant in the book of Job, see Green, "Stretching"; Max Rogland, "The Covenant in the Book of Job," *CTR* 7, no. 1 (2009): 49–62. For Deutero-Isaiah, see Anderson, "Exodus and Covenant."

<sup>811</sup> Rogland, "Covenant."

Exodus and Deuteronomy, we could not infer that the literary structure of Job as a whole is located in the theme of Israel's covenant, nor the covenantal ideology is deliberately supported by its editor. This is a misleading perception which appears in simplifying the diversity of the theological messages found in wisdom literature.<sup>812</sup> Legal and juridical languages in Job are too widespread in the Israelite and non-Israelite materials to be a distinct element of covenantal language.<sup>813</sup> Not all the languages of individual 'oath' demonstrate that there is a covenantal relation between humans and a deity. In addition, as Rogland claims,<sup>814</sup> the family language does not voluntarily make all the divine-human relationship a covenantal bond; though kinship covenant in the Old Testament may be advocated by many examples.<sup>815</sup>

Lastly, Job's 'blamelessness' before God and the pattern of blessings and curses might confirm the Deuteronomistic covenant; at least, we may agree that the book of Job shares many words and phrases in Deuteronomy (cf. Job 31). While all Job's suffering is derived from the decision of the heavenly council, not from the breach of law, God does not seem to have any responsibility to deal with the suffering of his pious sufferer (Job 2:3; 9:17). Job's friends interpret his suffering based on the Deuteronomistic covenant (4:6-9; 8:4) and advise that if Job seeks the Lord and keeps the Torah, his misfortunes will be reversed to prosperity (8:5-7; 22:21-23). In particular, we may recognise the potential reference to the covenantal bond between God and man in terms of the imposition of the Torah in Job 31.<sup>816</sup> Yet, what the entire structure of Job's story evinces is that its theology is quite different from the ideology of the

---

<sup>812</sup> Richard L. Schultz, "Unity or Diversity in Wisdom Theology? A Canonical and Covenantal Perspective," *TB* 48, no. 2 (1997): 271–306.

<sup>813</sup> Pietro Bovati, *Re-Establishing Justice: Legal Terms, Concepts and Procedures in the Hebrew Bible*, JSOT 105 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1994).

<sup>814</sup> Rogland, "Covenant," 56–61; Contra Jeffrey J. Niehaus, "Covenant: An Idea in the Mind of God," *JETS* 52, no. 2 (2009): 226–7.

<sup>815</sup> Scott Hahn, *Kinship by Covenant: A Canonical Approach to the Fulfillment of God's Saving Promises*, The Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library (New Haven: Yale UP, 2009). Anderson, "Typology," 181–2.

<sup>816</sup> See Oeming, "Hiob 31"; Witte, "Torah."

Deuteronomistic covenant.<sup>817</sup> The God of the innocent sufferer in reality is not acting in accordance with the assumed general principle of blessing to believers and of cursing to unbelievers. Job's agony is no more than part of God's random control of the world and the text simply tells us that Job is a weak creature who must accept divine determination without any inquiries. The principles of controlling and caring for wild animals in Yahweh's speech are not associated with Deuteronomistic covenantal relations, but instead, they speak of the harmony of the animal world between carnivore and herbivore and of sovereign wisdom and power. The emphasis in Yahweh's speech is not on God's caring for law-keeping people,<sup>818</sup> but on the mere management of the created world. In the presentation of the two symbolic beasts, Yahweh is not one who is limited to human laws and is able to be controlled by human justice, but he appears as a self-governing and sovereign God. Such an understanding of God's freedom seems contrary to the Deuteronomistic belief which probably appears in the close connection between Job's piety and blessings given by God in the prologue, and to the retribution theology which Job's friends maintained.

So, Yahweh's speech is far from the conventional belief in the Mosaic covenantal bond. God works in ways quite alien to human anticipation of righteous judgment because he has the perfect freedom to perform his will. Whether God discriminates against one group of people or not and he punishes the wicked or not, is wholly contingent on divine decision. Not even the final restoration of Job in the epilogue is confirmation of the Deuteronomistic covenant, as many note that it is; the God of Job appears as not paying great attention to judgment of human

---

<sup>817</sup> For the similar view with this, see Markus Witte, "Does the Torah Keep Its Promise? Job's Critical Intertextual Dialogue with Deuteronomy," in *Reading Job Intertextually* (NY: T&T Clark, 2013), 62. He argues: The critical reception of Job about Deuteronomistic theology "indicates a relativization of Deuteronomy and its theology in the progression of the poetry;" "Job seems from this point of view to be a critic of this torah, for it does not live up to its promise, as he know from his own experience and as God acknowledges, and because Job's God differs from and exceeds the deity described in Deuteronomy."

<sup>818</sup> Izak Spangenberg, "Who Cares? Reflections on the Story of the Ostrich (Job 39.13-18)," in *The Earth Story in Wisdom Traditions*, ed. Norman C. Habel and Shirley Wurst (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001), 92–102.



righteousness.<sup>819</sup> At the centre of the book of Job thus is that its author is probably antagonistic to the Deuteronomistic covenant, rather than positively receptive to it.

Secondly, Deutero-Isaiah certainly does not mention the Mosaic covenant. Bernhard Anderson argues analysing the references of the term ‘torah’ in Deutero-Isaiah that in any cases, there is no clear allusion ‘to Moses, the Sinai theophany, the decalog, or the conditional covenant’.<sup>820</sup>

Surprising that Deutero-Isaiah must be aware of the Pentateuchal tradition, in that the prophet includes overlapping imageries of Exodus tradition in the theme of the new exodus (Isa 40:3-5; 41:17-20; 42:14-16; 43:1-3, 14-21; 48:20-21; 49:8-12; 51:9-10; 52:11-12; 55:12-13),<sup>821</sup>

Anderson maintains that ‘the prophet ignored the Mosaic covenant altogether’, and ‘emphasized the “everlasting covenant” typified’ by Davidic and Noahic covenants.<sup>822</sup> His view in this regard is quite right. In addition, the themes of a second Exodus and of a miraculous journey through the desert may all not be rooted in Israel’s national story, which involves the notion of ברית.

Importantly, the future hope in the Davidic covenant and the rehabilitation of Davidic kingship from these references might have continued in the time of Deutero-Isaiah (Isa 55:3). For instance, Ronald Clements argues that the Davidic covenant (2 Sam 7; Ps 89) is still consistent in the prophetic tradition of Isaiah and the divinely appointed action of Cyrus the Persian king as Yahweh’s servant is understood as fulfilment for the sake of king David.<sup>823</sup> Nonetheless, this

---

<sup>819</sup> According to Clines, the book of Job “marginalizes” the doctrine of retribution’. See the following articles of Clines, *Job 1-20*, xlvi; also see “Deconstructing the Book of Job,” in *What Does Eve Do to Help?: And Other Readerly Questions to the Old Testament*, JSOT 94 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 106–23.

<sup>820</sup> Anderson, “Exodus and Covenant in Second Isaiah and Prophetic Tradition,” 341. For the similar expressions between Isa 48:17-19 and Ps 81:14-15, he notices that “unlike Psalm 81” Deutero-Isaiah “does not think of Israel’s future salvation as being contingent upon the renewal of the Mosaic covenant in the present”; *Ibid.*, 342.

<sup>821</sup> Anderson, “Typology,” 181–2.

<sup>822</sup> Anderson, “Exodus and Covenant,” 343.

<sup>823</sup> See Ronald E. Clements, “The Davidic Covenant in the Isaiah Tradition,” in *Covenant as Context: Essays in Honour of E.W. Nicholson*, ed. A. D. H. Mayes and Robert B. Salters (Oxford: Oxford UP,

link would not necessarily verify the continuous relationship with Davidic covenant in Deutero-Isaiah; in Isa 55:3d, it is unlikely to mean the specific reference to the Davidic promise in Ps 89,<sup>824</sup> and to be linked to its continuation. Yahweh's new act in Deutero-Isaiah is probably different from his commitment to the Davidic covenant in history, since Davidic promise itself in other biblical references may require which obligations and statutes Davidic successors must carry out; although it is more unconditional than Mosaic covenant (Ps 89:31-34; 132:11-12; 2 Sam 7:14-15).<sup>825</sup> Instead, the reference of Davidic covenant in Deutero-Isaiah implies the dimension of the new covenant (Isa 42:6; 49:8) which would mean the 'democratization' of the Davidic covenant.<sup>826</sup> God determines the new task of Israel as being to bring justice and to fulfil God's will for the world (42:1) for the sake of his own glory; this is different from the hope in the Davidic covenant (42:9; cf 48:9).<sup>827</sup> Since divine promises in the exilic period are moving toward establishing a new relationship based on unconditional protection and forgiveness, the interpretation should be recognised in the new covenant as being for the whole creation rather than the obligatory relationship with the Israelites.

---

2003), 39–70; Also see Steven L. McKenzie, "The Typology of the Davidic Covenant," in *Land That I Will Show You* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001), 152–78.

<sup>824</sup> See Eissfeldt, "Promises."

<sup>825</sup> Scholars have not agreed about the debate whether Davidic covenant (also Abrahamic covenant) should be viewed as "unconditional" and "unilateral". It is noteworthy to review the debate between Moshe Weinfeld and Gary Knoppers. Weinfeld designates covenants in Exodus and Deuteronomy as the "obligatory type" and the covenants with Abraham and David (Gen 5:17; 2 Sam 7; Ps 89) as "promissory type". On the contrary, Knoppers disagrees with Weinfeld's modelling of Davidic covenant as "'royal grant' so common in the ancient Near East." and claims that such a treatment based on the similarities between the Davidic covenant and the ancient Near Eastern "land grants" is "too narrow a definition to fit the evidence of either vassal treaties or royal grants". See Moshe Weinfeld, "The Covenant of Grant in the Old Testament and in the Ancient near East," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 90, no. 2 (1970): 184–203; Gary N. Knoppers, "Ancient Near Eastern Royal Grants and the Davidic Covenant: A Parallel?," *JAOS* 116, no. 4 (1996): 670–97.

<sup>826</sup> Scott Hahn, "Covenant in the Old and New Testaments: Some Current Research (1994-2004)," *CBR* 3, no. 2 (2005): 277; Williamson notices that "the covenant with David is here potentially transferred to the people as a whole." H. G. M. Williamson, *Variations on a Theme: King, Messiah and Servant in the Book of Isaiah*, Didsbury Lectures 1997 (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1998), 177.

<sup>827</sup> Goldingay, *Message*, 167.

Thus, the manner in which God related with man shown in the two books therefore seems to be incompatible with the covenantal belief in the Deuteronomistic history. God there is unlikely to intervene in human affairs as being contingent on human righteousness and the request for justice from humans is unlikely to put any heavy burden on God's side. In this sense, God is probably viewed as having little moral and ethical responsibility to take charge of any individuals or the nation (cf. Exod 24; Deut 4:13; 33:9; 2 Sam 7:13-15). In fact, the Mosaic covenant shown in Deutero-Isaiah seemed to be already broken by the Israelites' idolatry, while the entire message of the book of Job makes readers difficult to think of the portrayal of ethical God.<sup>828</sup>

In addition, the theology of Deutero-Isaiah is better considered as an extension to the theology of the book of Isaiah as a whole; though historical critics in the past strictly stressed the distinction between the First, Second, and Third sections of Isaiah. In this respect, Deutero-Isaiah reflects the overall interests and assumptions of the book of Isaiah; First Isaiah has some coherent sections with Deutero-Isaiah and there is evidence which show that First Isaiah may be rewritten in the Isaianic tradition (e.g., Isa 36-39); Third Isaiah is related to many of the concepts that we find in the book of Isaiah as a whole.<sup>829</sup> If it is right to see Deutero-Isaiah as a series of additions with other parts of Isaiah, it would be reasonable to suppose that the book of Isaiah as a whole has a theology distinguished from that of Deuteronomistic ideology.<sup>830</sup>

---

<sup>828</sup> David J. A. Clines, "Job's Fifth Friend: An Ethical Critique of the Book of Job," *BI* 12, no. 3 (2004): 233–50.

<sup>829</sup> Jacob Stromberg, *Isaiah after Exile: The Author of Third Isaiah as Reader and Redactor of the Book*, OTM (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2011) proposes Third Isaiah as a redactor of the book of Isaiah.

<sup>830</sup> For instance, see Donald C. Polaski, "Reflections on a Mosaic Covenant: The Eternal Covenant (Isaiah 24:5) and Intertextuality," *JSOT*, no. 77 (1998): 55–73.

### 6.1.3 Implications

#### *6.1.3.1 Problems of God's Judgment and Justice*

It is important for the authors of Job and Deutero-Isaiah that Yahweh is controlling the universe and that no other foreign gods are able to do it, so that the God of Israel, with the supreme and absolute power over the world, is able to do whatever he wishes. The emphasis on divine sovereignty and freedom in the two books is indicated in the way they describe divine judgment on human affairs. Although neither text rejects the traditional idea of God's judgment, both of them in different ways indicate that the divine treatment of the world is not always geared to justice or human behaviour, but it is geared to God's determination whether that appears to be either highly reasonable or unreasonable to the human intellect. On the one hand, in the book of Job, there is a long-standing controversy about divine justice between Job and Job's friends where there are definite tensions in understanding the validity of divine judgment. Although divine judgment is generally expressed in terms of the punishment of the wicked and the reward of the righteous, the definition of who are the wicked and the reasons for human suffering are not clearly spelled out throughout the dialogue. Job's speeches intensely deny the principle of right judgment and attest the prosperity of the wicked and the disastrous reality of the righteous. On the other hand, in Deutero-Isaiah, punishment and reward seem to be more to do with the working out of the divine will than anything else. Yahweh is the God who judges foreign nations and their gods by the retribution principle, but the rules of judgment and restoration in the case of Jacob-Israel are reversed in many ways, and are not restricted by retributive rules.

In other words, the human suffering in Job and Deutero-Isaiah is not associated with the proportionality of divine punishment. In other words, their authors suggest that God may punish people in a way that is not necessarily in proportion to the offence. Job is apparently attacked by God for no good reason (Job 2:3; 9:17). In Deutero-Isaiah, Israel, the servant of God is punished more than is appropriate for his transgressions or possibly for no good reason (Isa 40:2). The change from the traditional understanding of divine judgment results from the

ground-breaking theological view of divine freedom which the two books show, and this is different from the orthodox principle of God's judgment.

In addition, when considering the punishment of neighbouring nations outside Israel, it is more obvious that Yahweh is not bound by any rules. For instance, in the interpretation of ethics and justice in the Old Testament, according to John Barton, the covenantal principle is not the only means of his ruling.<sup>831</sup> He says:

*Ethics as obedience to God's expressed will certainly does occur in Old Testament literature, but it is by no means the exclusive view. Natural law, both in the weaker sense of moral principles supposed to be common to all men, and in the stronger sense of principles built in to the structure of things, is also present, not just at the primitive or early stages of Israelite thought, not just in peripheral literature, not just in material influenced by foreign sources, but at the conscious level of the arguments presented by the prophets, and probably also in some parts of the Pentateuch.*<sup>832</sup>

This judgment on foreign nations and gods in Deutero-Isaiah seems to be seen as punishment by the natural law or the universal rule of the world, not by the disobedience of God's law shown in the Mosaic law.<sup>833</sup> Since Babylonians are not under obligation to Yahweh who made the covenantal treaty with Israel, there is no judgment following the violation of the sacrificial system and the disobedience to God's laws. The punishment of Israel's enemies is not on account of the violation of the covenantal relationship, but the reason for their punishment was no more than their self-worship and hubris—לְעוֹלָם אֱהִיָּה גְבוֹרָתָא ('I will be queen forever'; Isa

---

<sup>831</sup> Barton claims that "the oracles on the nations in Amos 1 and 2 notoriously represent a difficulty for any view of the ethical tradition in ancient Israel which sees it as exclusively tied to law and covenant, since the nations here accused of war crimes cannot be thought of as standing in a covenant-relationship with Yahweh such as would entail the acceptance of Israelite norms of conduct in war." See John Barton, "Natural Law and Poetic Justice in the Old Testament," *JTS* 30, no. 1 (1979): 3; for the detailed study in the book of Amos, see *Amos's Oracles against the Nations: A Study of Amos 1.3-2.5*, SOTSMS 6 (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1980); "The Basis of Ethics in the Hebrew Bible," *Semeia*, no. 66 (1994): 15–7.

<sup>832</sup> Barton, "Natural," 13.

<sup>833</sup> According to Barton, Amos and Isaiah in Jerusalem representatively have the idea of the natural law in the Hebrew Bible. See *ibid.*, 7; Also see "Ethics in Isaiah of Jerusalem," *JTS* 32, no. 1 (1981): 1–18; "History and Rhetoric in the Prophets," in *Bible as Rhetoric* (London: Routledge, 1990), 51–64.

47:7a). Thus, if the natural law, as another rule which is built into the world, is the reason for the punishment of foreign nations, this is another way of running the world. When God helps the righteous by punishing the wicked by the most effective means, he can choose the natural law for retribution as much as he wishes. He was not under any compulsion to follow a fixed rule, because the ways in which God works are various.

#### *6.1.3.2 Differences between Job and Deutero-Isaiah*

The two books in themselves are not totally uniform. The role of God in Job is emphatically portrayed as a deity in control of the created world, while God in Deutero-Isaiah is seen as the deity controlling a series of religious, social and political events. Both texts highlight the ruling over the natural world, but in Deutero-Isaiah God's control over the world is concentrated on the dimension of Israel, foreign nations and their idols, while the book of Job lacks control over human history, but focuses on individuals' affairs. Moreover, they do not indicate a fixed plan for the future, but while Deutero-Isaiah remarks that God has divine intentions in human history, God in Job simply presents a huge design for running the world. We cannot know why the author of Job does not treat the issue of suffering in a historical timeline, but the theological concern is not history, but universal relationships with an individual.

Next, emphasis upon human-divine relationships in Job and Deutero-Isaiah calls for a fresh recognition of God's nature, not entangled in any obligations and laws. However, in the two books there are important differences in God's behaviour to humans. While the relationship between God and humans in Job is mainly concentrated on the life of an individual, not the whole of humanity, just as in the other books of the wisdom corpus, Deutero-Isaiah takes a macroscopic view and presents the multiple relationships in individual, national, and international dimensions. Furthermore, in Job the relationship between God and an individual is little better than the relationships which God creates with animals in the world; in particular, in the description of Behemoth and Leviathan.

Finally, in the understanding of divine judgment there are significant diversities between the two books. The ways in which God's reactions to an innocent sufferer and to the miserable community of the deportees are recounted are not equivalent. The book of Job focuses heavily on the issue of the unjust sufferings and fates of the individual, while Deutero-Isaiah talks widely about the disasters and the destiny of the Israelites in an encouraging way. With regard to the objects of God's judgment and human suffering, Job's suffering was what an innocent man received, while the initial cause of judgment in Deutero-Isaiah was the disobedience and sins of Israel against Yahweh. Furthermore, there are some differences in God's role in the two books. God in the epilogue (Job 42:7-17) appears as an eyewitness of Job's integrity just as Job wanted his deity to be his 'witness' (עֵד, שֹׁהֵד; 16:19), although God is seen in both books as ultimate judge over the world.

## 6.2 *The Context of Job and Deutero-Isaiah*

Considering those shared ideas observed above, let us compare them with other biblical literatures. I here evaluate them on two levels; one is the comparison between Job/Deutero-Isaiah and biblical materials in the Persian period; the other is between Job/Deutero-Isaiah and biblical texts dated to the Hellenistic period.

### 6.2.1 Job and Deutero-Isaiah in the Context of the Persian Period

Scribal texts which will be compared here include the entire cumulative literary heritage in the pre-exilic and exilic periods which can be considered to have already existed or to have been composed in the Persian period. This examination necessarily has to engage with the entire history of the formation of the biblical canon, and with the complicated study of the transmission history of biblical materials by multiple editors. Such a vast research, however, is beyond our scope. In terms of broad research about this issue, I refer to a few recent studies by

Erhard Gerstenberger and David Carr.<sup>834</sup> Let me add a few more words for caution's sake. It is not my intention to maintain either that biblical texts other than Job and Deutero-Isaiah have no concept of divine control and freedom or that the two books have no interaction with earlier Israelite materials, but other biblical materials could have similar views with the two books. What I am attempting to show is that the two books individually offer their own views on God's control and freedom as contemporary scribal thoughts, while other biblical materials tend to accept and interpret divine justice and the Mosaic covenant in a conventional way.

#### 6.2.1.1 *Historical Literature*

What the Pentateuch and Deuteronomistic texts generally describe about the relationship between God and the world is slightly different from the shared ideas in Job and Deutero-Isaiah. Firstly, they differ in the way in which they describe the created world. The world that Gen 1:1-2:3a portrays is one where creation is gradually constructed stepwise culminating with humans, and further the created world exists for the benefit of human beings and, simply put, the first man 'Adam' formed in the divine image becomes the head of all the created world. By contrast, the two books do not speak of creation in the way in which Genesis describes it. In Job, the created world is an incomprehensible and mysterious sphere far away from humans and the knowledge of creation is completely unknown and inaccessible to humans. Decisively, the cosmos does not serve humans, but exists for Yahweh's own benefit and pleasure (Job 38-41). In Deutero-Isaiah, the created world, including humans, is depicted more as the heavenly and earthly agent, which fulfils the divine will for the world (Isa 41:18-19; 44:3-5; 45:8; 55:12-13a) and its aim is not limited to benefits for humans. The two books thus tend to reject

---

<sup>834</sup> Gerstenberger, *Persian*; Carr, *Formation*; however, Carr's work has been very controversial in dating texts.



anthropologically formed creation theology in the priestly text and rather to downplay the significance of human beings (cf. Ps 8).<sup>835</sup>

Secondly, the scribal ideas in the two books, as discussed above, differ from the general idea of Mosaic and Deuteronomistic covenant. In the historical books, the Deuteronomistic theology, in which loyal obedience to God results in success and disobedience in disaster, occupies the substantial position (cf. Deut 8:6; 10:12; 11:22; 19:9). The message in historical literature implies the balanced allocation of blessing and cursing following obedience or disobedience to Torah. (Deut 5, 28). However, the lesson of the two books goes beyond the confines of the retribution principle of the Deuteronomistic theology. Even if biblical scholars have presented a number of interrelationships between Job and the Pentateuch/the Deuteronomistic texts, the framework of the book of Job neither describes Job as the ideal model of Torah nor pursues the Deuteronomistic tradition by adopting the Priestly document or Decalogue as a theological remedy for the problem of evil. In this sense, the nature of God portrayed in Job would be novel, although it is not utterly divergent from that in Deuteronomistic history. Likewise, the exiled community of Israel in Deutero-Isaiah is not challenged by the formulations of keeping Torah nor is Yahweh in Deutero-Isaiah restrained by any covenant, but himself determines human events and acts for the sake of his own glory.

#### *6.2.1.2 Hebrew Poetry*

Diverse aspects other than those found in Hebrew poetry (Psalms, Proverbs, and Lamentations) are observed in the texts of Job and Deutero-Isaiah. Firstly, the psalmist's hope that the Davidic dynasty and its kingship will be restored is based on the effectiveness of the Davidic covenant and reminds Israelites of the Davidic promise to overcome their national tragedies (Ps 89:30-32;

---

<sup>835</sup> According to Weinfeld, Deutero-Isaiah rejects the creation account of Genesis: i.e. in Deutero-Isaiah, God is the creator of darkness and chaos (Isa 45:7; 45:18; cf. Gen 1:2), any earthly form cannot be compared to Yahweh (Isa 40:18, 25; 46:5; cf. Gen 1:26), God does not need any help in creation (Isa 44:24; 40:13-14; cf. Gen 2:2-3), and God does not need to take a rest (Isa 40:28; cf. Gen 2:2-3). See 3.2.1 of this thesis.

132:11-12; cf. Isa 55:3).<sup>836</sup> Most texts of the Hebrew Bible assume the restoration of Davidic kingship in the Messianic hope throughout all the generations. But, the two books do not highlight the Davidic reference enough to be reminiscent of the orthodox relationship with Yahweh; the divine promise in Deutero-Isaiah is removed from the historical Davidic line to Israel and the nations, and it is not dependent on the Davidic covenant and to anticipate the restoration of its royal throne.

Secondly, the most telling aspect of how Job and Deutero-Isaiah deal with the divine-human relationship can be compared to the book of Lamentations. In Lamentation, the cause of the loss and pain of the city Zion that the poet laments is indicated as Judah's sin which brings Yahweh's wrath and punishment (Lam 1:8; 4:6). Such an explanation to why Israel suffered so much is rooted in the Deuteronomic belief of retribution and reward,<sup>837</sup> and Lamentations directs the nation to keep its faith in God (4:22; 5:19-22). However, by contrast, the suffering of Job is not the same as that of normal people and does not come as a consequence of human disobedience to a deity. Deutero-Isaiah gives more emphasis to the restoration of the exiled community in Babylon rather than to the national grief of Judah's destruction in history. In addition, in Lamentations, there are petitions for the restoration of the Israelites and complaints about the delayed answer from God (Lam 5:19-22), but there is no clear answer from God. However, Deutero-Isaiah is full of the message of 'comfort' for his people and the declaration of the coming glory of Yahweh and enunciates the assurance of divine control in human history (Isa 40:1, 5).

---

<sup>836</sup> Note that the Davidic covenant is less conditional, but has the conditional part (Ps 89:30-32).

<sup>837</sup> Of course, in Lamentations, there seems to be a question of the excessive punishment and pain to Israel. Gottwald notices "the discrepancy between the historical optimism of the Deuteronomic Reform and the cynicism and despondency evoked by these reversals of national fortune". He concludes that though "Lamentations accepts the Deuteronomic theory", it "senses an excess of punishment amounting to injustice". Gottwald, *Lamentations*, 51, 117. Bertil Albrektson, *Studies in the Text and Theology of the Book of Lamentations with a Critical Edition of the Peshitta Text*, Studia theologica Lundensia 21 (Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1963), 230 emphasises the tension between the historical reality and the confident belief of the Zion tradition, that Zion is inviolable in understanding its literary purpose.

Thirdly, the two books may be rather differentiated from the book of Proverbs which reinterprets the Deuteronomistic theology. The crucial message of Proverbs is that divine wisdom will be granted to those who choose the way of wisdom and accept the sayings of wisdom, i.e. to those who internalise the instruction and teaching of the Torah (Prov 9). According to such instructions and the laws of wisdom, life/death and blessing/cursing are given to the obedient and disobedient. The divine wisdom in Proverbs is accessible to whoever seeks and loves her (Prov 8:17, 21), while in Job (esp. Job 28; also Isa 45:15; 54:8; cf. 8:17) it is inaccessible to humans and her way is incomprehensible to individuals, since God is a being who hides Himself. Although the prologue of Job witnesses that Job already possesses the religious wisdom that Proverbs speaks of, it ironically was his personal piety to God that caused all the disasters and sufferings. In Deutero-Isaiah, God's 'thoughts' and 'ways' for nations go far beyond human expectations in orthodox belief (Isa 55:8-9).

Nonetheless, Prov 1-9 is in many ways different from the Deuteronomistic books as a way of understanding Torah and seems to develop its concern in its own context.<sup>838</sup> The writer of Prov 1-9, which would be formed in the late Persian period, reinterprets the covenant in a new way, in order to allow divine sovereignty, just as other literatures in the post-exilic period do. Reading and studying Torah will write the new covenant on people's hearts and change individuals (Prov 2:9-22; 9:7-12). It is very close to the ideas expressed in the books of Jeremiah and Ezekiel where divine wisdom in the law enables those who study it to discern the word of God and what the sense of right and wrong is. Then, the law does not exist for the purpose of a contract between humans and God, but for the teaching and instruction of humans. It is the divine revelation of how humans should behave, so that the task of humans is simply not only to obey rules, but also to learn, embrace, and love the law, so that humans can automatically perform what God wants them to do.

---

<sup>838</sup> See Stuart Weeks, *Instruction and Imagery in Proverbs 1-9* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007), 156–79.

### 6.2.1.3 Prophetic Literature

Job and Deutero-Isaiah are different from the typical prophetic books which are considerably influenced by Deuteronomic theology.<sup>839</sup> But, this does not mean that all the different theological concepts in the prophetic books can be reduced to one particular theology. Each prophetic book raises its own different voice, although the literary heritage of the Deuteronomic history obviously exists in them. Jeremiah and Hosea, for instance, have much stronger Deuteronomic theology and Mosaic tradition than other prophetic books, while Nahum, Habakkuk, Joel, and Jonah are less Deuteronomic.<sup>840</sup> Let us see an example from the book of Jonah which in the beginning predicts the destruction of a wicked gentile city, Nineveh in Mesopotamia. The prophet, who fears Yahweh (יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם אֲנִי יִרְאֶה; Jonah 1:9), but refuses his calling as shown as being full of longing of justice and of the particularistic belief throughout the whole story, is corrected and rectified by God who repents (וַיִּנָּחֵם הָאֱלֹהִים ) על־הָרָעָה; ‘And God repented the evil’, Jonah 3:10b) his initial condemnation. In this response, God of Jonah thoroughly is free to act from what Jonah expected in God’s command, and does what he pleased to do in the human history,<sup>841</sup> while humans are simply creatures like animals, plants, and bugs (Jonah 1:17; 4:6-7). In this sense, its theological idea in the perspective of law, justice, and judgment is quite different with classical prophetic books which declare the strict judgment to destroy foreign nations.<sup>842</sup> So, we need to see the diversity of prophetic messages

---

<sup>839</sup> Four prophetic books (Amos, Hosea, Micah, and Zephaniah) seem to have existed in the pre-exilic period, but they were revised in the late period. See Albright, *Israel in Exile*, 204–37. Haggai, Zechariah 1-8, Malachi, and Jonah are usually placed in the Persian period. Twelve prophetic books are likely to have been revised by the Deuteronomic construction in late time. Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel would have been developed through the late exilic and early Persian periods. See Gerstenberger, *Persian*, 187–200, 306–47.

<sup>840</sup> Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 129–38, 320–70; Richard J. Coggins, “An Alternative Prophetic Tradition,” in *Israel’s Prophetic Tradition* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge UP, 1982), 77–94.

<sup>841</sup> Bolin states that “in Jonah the fundamental issue is the affirmation of the absolute freedom, power, and sovereignty of Yahweh over all creation” and “these divine attributes are beyond the bounds of any human notions of justice, mercy or logic”. See Thomas M. Bolin, *Freedom beyond Forgiveness: The Book of Jonah Re-Examined*, JSOT 236 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1997), 183.

<sup>842</sup> *Ibid.*, 184–5.

according to their contexts. Let us compare the ideas of Job and Deutero-Isaiah to the messages of the conventional prophetic books.

Firstly, Job and Deutero-Isaiah lack the idea of the divine election of a single nation and instead are much closer to the idea of universalism.<sup>843</sup> In the prophetic books, the two distinct ideas of ‘nationalism’ can be understood in the consistent framework of the covenantal relationship. However, universalism in Deutero-Isaiah is more explicit than in any of the other prophetic books, and the hoped-for restoration of the Davidic dynasty is extended into all the nations.<sup>844</sup> The focus on Israel’s fate is found in the ‘parochialism’<sup>845</sup> of Ezekiel, while Deutero-Isaiah strongly emphasises the universalistic concern of God as the Creator who dwells in a cosmic temple, not in the specific territory of Jerusalem. On the other hand, the story of Job happens to a non-Israelite individual and does not mention the security of the elected people at all. The relationship between man and God is largely unconstrained by such concepts as the ‘election’ of Israel, but interestingly, Yahweh elects two beasts for his purpose, just as Yahweh in Deutero-Isaiah particularly chooses the Persian king Cyrus for the salvation of the world.

Secondly, Job and Deutero-Isaiah announce the new age of a human-divine relationship not entwined with Torah granted in the Mosaic covenant while most prophetic texts are based on the ethical requirements of satisfying a certain rule as a condition of divine forgiveness (e.g. Amos 5:15). By contrast, the book of Job has an anti-covenantal mind-set which struggles against the view of God restricted to the human-deity contract. The prologue of Job examines the conventional relationship between humans and God and is even averse to it as treaty or

---

<sup>843</sup> But, in Deutero-Isaiah, the theme of ‘election’ of Israel is even more important on the theme of ‘covenant’.

<sup>844</sup> In addition, Deutero-Isaiah extends the divine calling or appointment to all the nations opening up universalism. Of course, the similarity between Jeremiah’s calling and commissioning the Servant of Yahweh who is the Israelite community exists with certain shared vocabularies (Isa 49:5-6; Jer 1:5), but the mission of Jacob-Israel surpasses the national security and the reconstruction of Davidic kingdom and is bound to serve the universalistic purpose as ‘a light for the nations’ (Isa 49:6b).

<sup>845</sup> Daniel Isaac Block, *The Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 1-24*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 47.

contract. The entire message of Job doubts that the Creator is required to respond to human expectation and any obligation. On the other hand, Deutero-Isaiah establishes the unprecedented relationship between humans and God other than covenantal rules and obligations which the forefathers of Israel made in Exodus.

Nonetheless, there are exceptionally late prophetic texts which are close to the view of Job and Deutero-Isaiah; for instance, Jeremiah and Ezekiel highlight the new covenantal relationship with everyone (Jer 31:30-34; 32:40; Ezek 37:26; Isa 55:3). The idea of the new covenant in the book of Jeremiah (Jer 31:31-37), which is quite distinct from Mosaic covenant, but closer to the two books, would probably have emerged from the same scribal circle as Job and Deutero-Isaiah in the Persian period. God will automatically make a new covenant by putting Yahweh's laws on their hearts (Jer 31:33), so that they may not be broken. However, the way in which Jeremiah states the covenant is different from that which Job and Deutero-Isaiah use. The author of Job, if there is any view of covenants relevant to the book of Job, shows a sceptical view of the idea of any covenants, while the book of Jeremiah presents the transformation and enlargement of former covenants. The new covenant in Jeremiah will be finally dispensed to people along with divine judgment at the end (Jer 44:30; 52:1-34), but in Deutero-Isaiah, there is little judgment as the consequence of human sins, and in Job it is not the underlying thought.

In sum, these shared ideas in Job and Deutero-Isaiah are more or less different from the general commonalities of biblical texts which have been composed, edited, or reshaped in the Persian period. When investigating the two books based on shared ideas, we may confirm that their theology denies the confident belief that the world is unshakably governed by the Mosaic covenant with their God, and attacks the retribution theology which is especially dominant in Deuteronomic ideology. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that both books are fairly similar to biblical books such as Proverbs, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel.

### 6.2.2 Job and Deutero-Isaiah in the Context of the Hellenistic Period

It is time to consider whether some of those ideas in Job and Deutero-Isaiah are found in biblical texts of the late Persian and Hellenistic period; if so, they could be seen as also being Hellenistic ideas, or if not, we might say that they are only Persian ideas. Books which belong to this period are Daniel, 1-2 Chronicles, and Zechariah 9-14,<sup>846</sup> and I choose two representative books, Daniel and Ecclesiastes. Although the book of Daniel has its literary setting in the sixth century BCE, events which are referred to are based on what has happened in the past. In general, it has been claimed that in its final form Dan 2-6 belongs to the late Persian period and the remainder, including redaction of the entire book, probably dates around the time of the Temple dedication (164 BCE).<sup>847</sup> As regards Ecclesiastes, part of the book echoes the pre-exilic materials, but the dating to the present form would not be earlier than the Persian period and would probably belong to the Hellenistic period when considering a significant amount of redacted parts and additional materials.<sup>848</sup> Again, not all the concepts discovered in Daniel and Ecclesiastes may belong to those arisen in the Hellenistic period. However, true, in general, entitling the book of Daniel into the apocalyptic genre ‘as a distinct class of writing’<sup>849</sup> may be widely acceptable, while the idea of determinism in Ecclesiastes is possibly attached into the Hellenistic era. If these notions were widespread throughout the Hellenistic period, it would be quite appropriate to dating books of Job and Deutero-Isaiah by comparing Daniel and Ecclesiastes with the two books.

---

<sup>846</sup> Ezra-Nehemiah and Esther are considered as belonging in the period of the Hasmonean uprising and Kingdom (167-63 BCE).

<sup>847</sup> See John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel*, HSM no. 16 (Missoula, Mont: Scholars, 1977), 30, 32; Carr, *Introduction*, 252; Michael Knibb, “The Book of Daniel in Its Context,” in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, ed. John Joseph Collins and Peter W. Flint, vol. 1, FIOTL (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 18; John Goldingay, *Daniel*, WBC 30 (Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1989), 326.

<sup>848</sup> See C. L. Seow, “Linguistic Evidence and the Dating of Qoheleth,” *JBL* 115, no. 4 (1996): 643–66; Weeks, *Scepticism*, 5–6; Carr, *Formation*, 448–55.

<sup>849</sup> John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*, The biblical resource series (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), 14; also see *Daniel: With an Introduction to Apocalyptic Literature*, The Forms of the Old Testament Literature 20 (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1984).

### 6.2.2.1 *Daniel and Ecclesiastes*

Let us consider whether the belief in divine control in Job and Deutero-Isaiah is found in later books. Divine action as shown in the book of Daniel seems to be similar to that of the Persian concept of divine control. It might be said that because Deutero-Isaiah deals with human destiny, it certainly has a sort of apocalyptic eschatology. However, the divine control of the world in Deutero-Isaiah needs to be distinguished from that of the apocalyptic genre in Daniel which consists of a series of visions and dreams.<sup>850</sup> God in Deutero-Isaiah is not managing the world with a fixed timeline to fulfil his future plan, but is simply reacting to human events. The idea of planning for the future in the developed genre of apocalypse is not found until the Hellenistic period; e.g., Daniel, 1 Enoch, 2 Enoch, 4 Ezra, and 2 Apocalypse of Baruch. Therefore, the divine control over the nations and nature is very different from the sort of idea that we find in apocalyptic literature where everything is much more mechanical, and history is working through a fixed pattern of events. In the same way, the divine act in Ecclesiastes is much closer to the Hellenistic eschatological view, rather than the simple reactions to human behaviour shown in Job and Deutero-Isaiah (Eccl 12:13-14). Ecclesiastes demonstrates that the natural phenomena are unceasingly no more than part of the continuing process (Eccl 1:2-11) and that in the world, God controls the pleasure of eating and drinking (2:24), wealth and possession (5:19), and human behaviour (9:1-2). The passage of Eccl 3:1-15 emphasises the ‘appointed time’ (עת) for every business (לכל־חפץ) and for human feelings (love and hatred) which are controlled by God, and highlights God’s act which cannot be changed by humans (Eccl 3:11, 14). These do not usually emerge from the Persian scribal culture; Deutero-Isaiah

---

<sup>850</sup> Collins opposes the claim of Paul Hanson about apocalyptic texts in post-exilic texts and argues that “the hope for a new heaven and a new earth (Isa. 65:17) is certainly relevant to the history of apocalypticism, but it should not be labeled ‘apocalyptic’ without serious qualification.” See John J. Collins, “From Prophecy to Apocalypticism: The Expectation of the End,” ed. John J. Collins, *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism* (NY: Continuum, 2000); Paul D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic: The Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979). Also see Michael E. Stone, “Apocalyptic Literature,” in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran, Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*, ed. Michael E. Stone, CRINT 2 (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984), 383–441.



and Job have neither such a strong symbolic language nor a deterministic idea of a final judgment.

Secondly, in later literatures, is the issue of God's freedom from any rules and human suffering likely to be considered as important as the early Persian scribes stated? Certainly, there is little room in Ecclesiastes for the covenantal relationship with humans in which God assumes obligations. Although God in all ways acts in the present, humans cannot predict what God will do, and all happenings are in the area of God's knowledge (Eccl 3:11; 8:17; 11:5). God is so unpredictable that human wisdom and knowledge are useless (Eccl 9:11-12) and he is free to determine where all gifts should be given; in this sense, there is no distinction between good and bad laws (Eccl 2:26; 5:20). In addition, the concept of divine judgment in Ecclesiastes is too murky in most places, and it does not fit in well with Ecclesiastes' other ideas; although the author seems to be obliged to adopt the idea of judgment because of the general assumption in the context of Israelite literature. For instance, retribution and judgment in this life are delayed and justice to sinners is not executed (8:11-12a). The wicked are treated as if they were righteous, the righteous are treated as if they are wicked (8:14). Ecclesiastes notices that humans should not be overly wise or foolish, since life will end up in death and everything under heaven will become הבל (Eccl 7:15-16). Can we suppose that such an idea of God's freedom indicated in Job and Deutero-Isaiah is found in Ecclesiastes? It is certain that Ecclesiastes shows little interest on the Mosaic covenant and does not follow the Deuteronomic theology of retribution and reward. However, the concept of God's judgment in Ecclesiastes gets entangled in a fixed time and event which is already predestined (Eccl 3:17; 10:8; 11:9b).

Is this idea also found in the book of Daniel? Whether the God of Israel delivers his people or not, three pious men resolve to keep their integrity and loyalty to their God (Dan 3:17-18).<sup>851</sup> Tales of Daniel and his three friends (Dan 1-6) portray God who is always near to those who trust in His promise, and who faithfully saves his people. The book of Daniel, influenced by late Judaism, is strongly tied up with the religious impositions and ethical obligations to their God—food laws (1:8), the rejection of idolatry (3:18), and regular prayer (6:10)—and urges them to commit themselves to him.<sup>852</sup> In some ways, because the usage of the phrase ברית קדש in Daniel 11:28, 30 (cf. 9:3, 27; 11:22, 32) may attest the concept of ברית,<sup>853</sup> one may argue that the relationship in Daniel affirms the Deuteronomistic covenant. However, while the texts of Daniel use the term ‘covenant’ in some places, we should not misunderstand personal piety as being the idea of the Deuteronomistic covenant. Traditional ideas of Israel’s history in Daniel 9 are tied up with a further apocalyptic divine plan. There is a solid development of personal piety going hand in hand with the idea of divine plan. Of course, in the book of Daniel, there might be a little space inside the divine plan which humans may change through prayers and pious behaviour. However, the idea of a divine plan would not come into being as the result of the prayer which might be theologically problematic (Dan 9:1-23), but rather from that point onwards, all the humans are acting according to the divine plan which they cannot see and fully comprehend. Humans can never force God to pay attention to their affairs in Daniel. So, the sort of personal piety in Daniel is dependent on the notion that divine plans and processes are too enormous for individual humans to comprehend.

In addition, what both Ecclesiastes and Daniel have in common is the notion of a divine ‘plan’, but the theological ideas in Ecclesiastes partly contradict those in the book of Daniel and they

---

<sup>851</sup> John Barton, “Theological Ethics in Daniel,” in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, ed. John Joseph Collins and Peter W. Flint, vol. 2, FIOTL (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 663.

<sup>852</sup> Ibid., 2:662.

<sup>853</sup> See Arie van der Kooij, “The Concept of Covenant (berît) in the Book of Daniel,” in *Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings* (Louvain: Leuven UP, 1993), 495–501.

do not agree with what the plan is and how it works. In Ecclesiastes, the idea of a divine plan is slightly different because Ecclesiastes supposes that every human action, however small, is part of the divine plan. It is therefore much harder to find any part that humans can change, so that Ecclesiastes has a more intrusive deterministic idea than the book of Daniel; although neither has a clear philosophical idea of ‘determinism’. On the contrary, to the writer of Daniel, God’s actions are at a higher level dealing with nations and empires where God’s main interest is in controlling happenings in order that the world might run according to his plan. So, in both Ecclesiastes and Daniel, because the way in which he acts accords with his plan, the concept of human petitions would be theologically problematic in late scribal texts which emphasise God’s fixed plan over the world.

### 6.2.3 Implications

It is time to consider reasons why the Mosaic (or Deuteronomistic) ‘covenant’ is accepted in some scribal literature and is rejected in other scribal texts, and why the idea of ‘plan’ emerges from some of them and is not found in others. What do these discrepancies and differences among biblical texts attest about scribes and the historical development of the biblical materials? Two important conclusions about these issues can be drawn; the one is that the diversity in theological ideas hints at the different dating of books; the other is that the diversity represents the degree of various ideas among the scribes. Let us summarise these through two theological ideas: the Mosaic ‘covenant’ and divine ‘plan’.

Firstly, given that the book of Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic history are a product of scribal culture, what conclusions can one draw from the fact that some scribal literatures subscribe to the law and covenantal theology, and others do not? We have seen that Job and Deutero-Isaiah have a strong interest and concern in God of Israel as Universal and as the sovereign Creator who is free from human constraints and rules based on the Mosaic covenant. To some degree it has been agreed that the earlier edition of Deuteronomy, possibly the ‘Josiah’s edition’ has been dated to the pre-exilic period after the political impact of Assyrian

empire (722 BCE) and that its exilic edition has been written in the reflection of the destruction of Jerusalem;<sup>854</sup> the ‘Covenant Code’ in Exod 20:22-23:33 which covers Deuteronomy has been treated as an earliest form of biblical law;<sup>855</sup> the Deuteronomistic history would be produced in the exilic and the early post-exilic period.<sup>856</sup> If this dating is acceptable in our comparison, it could probably be a reasonable supposition that these ideas—the universal character and supreme freedom of Yahweh—probably remain concentrated in the scribes of the Persian period compared to those of the Neo-Assyrian and exilic period. However, this does not mean that Deuteronomistic editors did not continue to work and there was the rapid cessation of Deuteronomistic ideology at a subsequent time after Exile.<sup>857</sup> In this regard, this dating of Job and Deutero-Isaiah compared to the Mosaic and Deuteronomistic covenant might be problematic. Nevertheless, such a critical discussion of the Mosaic covenant in Job or the new interpretation of the relationship between humans and God in Deutero-Isaiah would not appear before Exile and could most possibly emerge in a later period than in the early period. For instance, the character of the God of Job and Deutero-Isaiah in many aspects is similar with that of God in the books of Jeremiah and Ezekiel; although Jeremiah to a great degree has been revised and expanded by Deuteronomistic editors throughout the exilic and post-exilic period and Ezekiel describes the relation between Israel and God based on old literary collections (Ezek 11:20; 14::11; 34:20, 30-31; 36:28; 37:23).<sup>858</sup> Jeremiah and Ezekiel are closely engaged with the idea of a new covenant that transform people’ hearts, where the Mosaic covenant is

---

<sup>854</sup> Carr, *Formation*, 307–17; *Introduction*, 132–51, 172–3; Peter R. Ackroyd, *Exile and Restoration: A Study of Hebrew Thought of the Sixth Century B.C.*, OTL (London: SCM, 1968), 62–83; Alberty, *Israel in Exile*, 271–302.

<sup>855</sup> Carr, *Introduction*, 79, 138.

<sup>856</sup> Gerstenberger, *Persian*, 274–8.

<sup>857</sup> The Deuteronomistic history with Deuteronomy continued to be read, transmitted and revised, since they would be regarded as valuable because of some theological reasons and those ideas could be, in renewed ways, qualified in other Torah-centred writings. Certainly, the law and covenant in Deuteronomistic history would have been reformulated further in the situation of the Judean community after the exilic period, and later on with the emergence of Judaism, the significance of the Deuteronomistic theology which is tied up with the Mosaic covenantal faith could have been accelerated in the Second-Temple Jewish community.

<sup>858</sup> Block, *The Book of Ezekiel*, 48–9.

reinterpreted and reformulated. In other words, what we find in Job and Deutero-Isaiah is not different from Jeremiah and Ezekiel, in that Job gives a critical view of the covenantal theology and Deutero-Isaiah constructs a completely new rule for the relationship between humans and God. For another example, we may see the same theological shift in Prov 1-9 which reinterprets the covenant and law in a new context in which Torah becomes less problematic; although some may find linguistic clues to date part of Prov 1-9 in the pre-exilic period, and proverbial collections support the idea of retribution and reward based on laws and commandments. Therefore, we may say that Job and Deutero-Isaiah seem to be attuned to the later texts by the indicator of Mosaic 'covenant'.

Furthermore, this comparison would certainly help us to understand why Job and Deutero-Isaiah do not support the Deuteronomistic covenantal idea in historical development, but criticise the moral order in retribution principles. If the book of Deuteronomy and the ideas expressed in the Deuteronomistic history had become problematic in the Persian period, some scribal texts composed or revised in the Persian period could have reflected the shift in the social and historical belief of the relationship between God and humans. That is, the rise of an anti-covenantal notion and the growing emphasis on the freewill of God and on the inability of humans to constrain God shown in the two books would mark the substantial decline of Deuteronomistic theology.

Secondly, given that the biblical texts of the Hellenistic period originate from a circle of Jewish scribes, what consequences can one suppose from the fact that Deutero-Isaiah and Job have no concept of a divine plan for the world and that the later texts such as Daniel, Ecclesiastes, and Zechariah 9-14 do contain it? The concept of the human-divine relationship in Job and Deutero-Isaiah which lacks any idea of plan is fundamentally different from that found in all the apocalyptic materials. Ecclesiastes has a heavy idea of 'planning' and Daniel strongly portrays the same idea where God determines the course of world history. But, texts of Job and Deutero-Isaiah have the concept of a deity who does not have a fixed future plan. Thus, if the thought of a divine plan and deterministic notion in Daniel and Ecclesiastes is the later notion which is not

seen in the two books, Job and Deutero-Isaiah may be more attuned to earlier texts in the Persian period. Divine sovereignty and freedom in the two would have been developed or transposed into the scribal idea of ‘planning’ shown in the late biblical materials.

Consequently, Job and Deutero-Isaiah most probably reflect the scribal ideas of the period between the critical reception of the Deuteronomistic theology and the rise of the apocalyptic theology. Considering this implication, one may allow for the diversity and discrepancy within the scribal class in the Second Temple period and may consider the dynamic shift in their cultural concern. We would observe the historical development of scribal ideas, if considering that the scribal culture is evolving over time. We, however, should never exclude the possibility that some earlier texts can have a very high view of God, and some late texts can have an old-fashioned view of God; if we properly understand that texts are the creative products of collective memory and knowledge reflecting their cultural and historical situation. Nevertheless, we may not deny that there is a general movement in biblical literature from the concept of a personal and national God towards a supreme God of the universe who has everything planned in advance.

#### 6.2.4 Job and Deutero-Isaiah in the Ancient Near Eastern Context

These shared ideas are part of a much broader picture of thought in the ancient Near Eastern world and we need to discuss them in the relationship to other neighbouring cultures.

##### 6.2.4.1 *Divine Intervention in the Ancient Near Eastern Literature*

The notion of the gods’ intervention in human events is certainly not a distinctive idea appearing only in the Hebrew Bible, although biblical texts were particularly interested in the purposeful action of God. Albrektson, for instance, affirmed that it is not an idea found only in Hebrew thought, and he gave many examples from Babylonian religions in which deities are

intervening in history and in human affairs.<sup>859</sup> If his argument is right, we should be careful in claiming that Israelite literatures are distinctive from foreign texts. Nonetheless, in understanding God's action and role in history—ways in which he punishes or rewards humans and how God runs the world with divine power—<sup>860</sup> we see that there is a diversity of fundamental views between Israelite and non-Israelite texts. The difference is not whether a god intervenes in history or not, but the way in which the nature of a god is presented in different cultures and literatures.<sup>861</sup> The God of the Hebrews is the unique God and the highest God who is all powerful in controlling the whole universe and achieves all that he wishes.

For instance, Yahweh in Deutero-Isaiah works in the history of the exiled community bringing forth Cyrus as Yahweh's servant. The idea of divine control there is indicated in world history as well as in Israel's political and religious situation. And, this is an idea of the book of Job where Yahweh enables Job to become a wealthy person, protects him, and then makes him go through disasters. Indeed God intervenes in casual daily ways in Job's life and even destroys and then restores his possessions and health. Job there seems to be the faithful servant of God and shows complete submission as a servant of God. Moreover, the Satan, who is acting for God, could bring disaster on Job using Sabeans, fire, Chaldeans, and wind to take his possessions, and could strike with disease threatening his life.

By contrast, in Mesopotamian religion, gods may be asked to intervene in the world, and humans can either give offerings and sacrifices to their deities or pray to them for their intervention in human events. They, however, do not pay a great deal of attention to bringing retribution and do not universally confirm their roles in running human affairs and in changing

---

<sup>859</sup> See Albrektson, *History*, 68–97; Saggs also supports Albrektson's view. See H. W. F. Saggs, *The Encounter with the Divine in Mesopotamia and Israel*, JLCR 12 (London: Athlone, 1978), 64–92.

<sup>860</sup> For observations on the difference between Hebrew thought and ancient Near Eastern ideas in terms of divine intervention and destiny, see W. G. Lambert, "Destiny and Divine Intervention in Babylon and Israel," in *Witness of Tradition* (Leiden: Brill, 1972), 65–72.

<sup>861</sup> See Albrektson, *History*, 96.

history, but they have other works to do and do not concern themselves with running human life. Likewise, people in the Greco-Roman period believed that their gods frequently intervened in human affairs to judge humans.<sup>862</sup> When considering ancient Greek mythology, the religious concepts expressed in Greek literatures contain ideas of moral judgment, order, and law.<sup>863</sup> However, the justice of gods in Greek texts is not dependent on a single system of moral law or on the decision of an absolute God, but is no more than intermittent interventions in terms of revenge, retaliation, punishment/reward, and wrath in interesting human affairs. For instance, in Homer's *Iliad*, Zeus's intervention which is carried out by *atê*, ('the eldest daughter of Zeus')<sup>864</sup> when she brings about misfortunes in the human world is not the same as the divine control in Israelite writings. Therefore, while divine intervention in history in a general sense is a common view in the writings of the ancient Near East and should not be considered as a development exclusive to Judaism, it should be distinguished by their individual ideas in their own literatures.

#### 6.2.4.2 *Personal Piety in the Late Ancient Near Eastern Context*

Furthermore, it is possible to draw close parallels between attitudes to God in Job and Deutero-Isaiah and attitudes to God that we find in a number of late texts from other foreign countries. For instance, by the time of the New Kingdom (1540-1070 BCE; 18<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup> dynasties) in ancient Egypt, a new religiosity that is connected to a strong personal piety and to the notion of a single and powerful god emerged particularly from the Ramesside period (19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> dynasties). Jan Assmann has argued that the 'new solar theology' in the pre-Amarna period, was converted by

---

<sup>862</sup> See John Gwyn Griffiths, *The Divine Verdict: A Study of Divine Judgement in the Ancient Religions*, SHR 52 (Leiden: Brill, 1991), 47–109.

<sup>863</sup> Cf., *Dike* ('Astraea' or 'Justita') which means 'personification of Justice' punishing injustice (OCD, 451-2); *Erinyes* which is 'divine beings exacting retribution for wrongs and blood-guilt especially in the family, often associated with disaster such as disease, madness or serious pollution' (OCD, 535); *Moirai* ('fates') which refer to goddesses to control human destinies (OCD, 569).

<sup>864</sup> Griffiths notices that "theologically the concept of *atê* is one of disturbing moral connotation". See Griffiths, *Verdict*, 59.



the Amarna religion into a new theology in the Ramesside age that emphasises ‘personal piety’.<sup>865</sup> By the time of the Hellenistic and Greco-Roman period, there are prevalent literatures from demotic Egyptian script such as the instruction of *Papyrus Insinger* (the second century CE)<sup>866</sup> which are full of sayings about the inability of humans to control individual lives. It may also be seen in late Mesopotamian texts, which include an elevated idea of personal piety. If we look at late Babylonian literature such as the *Sayings of Ahiqar* written in an Aramaic papyrus which represents broad Mesopotamian ideas in the early first millennium period (approximately 500 BCE),<sup>867</sup> one may find a very high idea of the gods controlling the world.

In this sense, although we have seen texts similar to the book of Job such as *The Debate between a Man and His Soul* and *Ludlul bēl nēmeqi* from the early ancient Near Eastern literatures, the sort of scribal ideas found in Job and Deutero-Isaiah, in terms of theology, is much more similar to those found in later ancient texts; this is the point at which Judaism is interacting closely with social and religious thoughts in other nations.

### 6.3 Conclusion

There are many reasons to consider that both Job and Deutero-Isaiah share common scribal ideas in the Persian period, but it is neither because one used the other nor because they used specific literary traditions, but because they are naturally emerging from the same social context which is ‘scribal’. Those concerns and ideas would not emerge from an abrupt change of their worldview, but would be due to the new cultural agenda that the scribal experts in the Persian period could adopt or would be interested in. Two consequences can be summarised.

---

<sup>865</sup> Assmann, *Search*, 222; However, Assmann sometimes tends to put too much emphasis on so-called religious changes and reforms. John Baines and Elizabeth Froom bring interesting corrections, nuances to Assmann’s views. See John Baines and Elizabeth Froom, “Piety, Change and Display in the New Kingdom,” in *Ramesside Studies in Honour of K.A. Kitchen*, ed. Mark Collier and S. R. Snape (Bolton: Rutherford, 2011), 1–17.

<sup>866</sup> Miriam Lichtheim, *AEL*, vol. 3 (Berkeley: University of California, 1980), 184–217.

<sup>867</sup> James M. Lindenberger, *The Aramaic Proverbs of Ahiqar* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1983).

Firstly, these scribal ideas of divine sovereignty over the world and of the arbitrariness of Yahweh in Job and Deutero-Isaiah differs significantly from that in other texts. Those notions may more be attuned to the Persian texts such as Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Proverbs than to the idea of the Mosaic or Deuteronomic covenant. And they are more in tune with the earlier texts than the late texts such as Ecclesiastes and Daniel in the Hellenistic period which contain the concept of 'plan'. This indicates that the two books were possibly formed between the waning days of Deuteronomic theology and the growth of apocalyptic literature .

Secondly, we may confirm that although there are likely to be little possibility of direct reference to specific non-Israelite materials, there are Mesopotamian and Egyptian texts which deal with similar concepts found in the two books; e.g., the issue of undeserved suffering, *Ludlul bēl nēmeqi* ('the Babylonian Job') where the speaker expresses his experience of abandonment and over-punishment by his god; and *Papyrus Insinger* which contains the idea of divine control. This claim with regard to Jewish scribal ideas growing up in the cultural diversity of other ancient Near Eastern civilizations could help us to affirm the significance of the broader cultural knowledge which scribes possessed and developed.

## Conclusion

We have confirmed that there are limitations in the previous comparative researches on the relationship between Job and Deutero-Isaiah. Although every assertion made by biblical scholars on the relationship between the two books does not stand up, there are more or less significant characteristics shared by the two books which seem to go beyond the similarities that each shares with other books in the Hebrew Bible. In this study, I have proposed that the theory of the scribal culture is crucial in understanding the circumstances surrounding the writing of the Hebrew Bible. What we have seen from the cultural milieu of the ancient Near East is that scribes had a broad knowledge of Israelite and foreign literatures and utilised this in their writing activities. As the consequence of these arguments, scribal ideas in the two books—God's control and his freedom—have been proposed; it seems reasonable to propose that these shared ideas between the two books are the result of cultural values and insights which the literati of the Persian period inherited and practised.

Now let us consider several implications about the scribal culture and interconnectedness which Job and Deutero-Isaiah extensively testify in relation with Israelite and non-Israelite sources. Firstly, the fact that linguistic connections between Job and Deutero-Isaiah do not necessarily attest the literary relationship could be applied to studies of similarities between any biblical materials. For instance, this is highly relevant to comparative studies between the wisdom texts and other parts of Israelite writings; e.g., between Proverbs and Deuteronomy; between Job and Amos/Deuteronomy; Ecclesiastes and Isaiah/Pentateuch; Tobit/Ben Sira and Deuteronomy. One may observe overlapping terms and expressions between two literary units, whatsoever they are, and may argue either that there is a literary dependence between two corresponding books or that there is the particular influence of a literary tradition such as the wisdom or the sapiential tradition. There may be sufficient reliability in those arguments, especially during the late Second Temple period, and it is not impossible to trace earlier sources from a later source. But, caution is needed in those studies of literary dependence/influence. If considering that the

text is reciprocally and intricately connected in infinite linguistic webs, and that ancient scribes could use an abundance of cultural knowledge without any restraint in unlimited intertexts, we may recognise that biblical literature would not arise from a specific text or a single literary tradition. Here, this study concerning the relationship between Job and Deutero-Isaiah provides a hint as to the direction which the intertextual study in biblical materials needs to take.

Secondly, the study of scribal culture may complement the limits of form criticism which has related to the basis for the socio-historical background of the Hebrew Bible. Again, far be it from me to claim that form criticism should be dismissed, because of the latest hypothesis of the Hebrew scribes. Rather, what I suggest is that the idea of scribal culture may fill a major gap between the context in which separate groups of prophets and sages are viewed as writers of their literary genres and the broader context in which scribes are regarded as substantial composers and producers of biblical texts. Whether or not a distinct group produced a particular type of literature, familiarity with such a broad literary context explains the unlimited literary interconnections and makes them an asset, not a problem. Indeed, what we are reading and need to understand is not only historical background rooted in ‘wisdom’, ‘prophetic’, and ‘priestly’ elements, but also, more significantly, scribal concerns and ideas reflecting their surrounding culture. If scribes had possessed memorised verbatim knowledge about early collective writings, they could have used and practised it to indicate their intellectual, religious, cultural concerns and values. Commonalities between Job and Deutero-Isaiah with other scribal texts of the Persian Period would reflect such collective values, in order to educate scribal students and children and shape their worldview. However, we should not think of scribal culture as a single set of ideas, but should consider the diverse thoughts among the scribal experts. One should avoid assuming that every biblical book subscribes to the same theological ideas either of ‘covenant’ or of ‘plan of history’, if we accept as true that biblical literature arose over a period of some centuries. As we have seen, different members of the scribal class, who in one set of circumstances could write the book of Deuteronomy which uses covenantal language and

serves the Mosaic covenant, could, in other contexts, produce texts sceptical of Israel's covenantal faith.

In addition, recognising scribal values gives a new understanding to biblical literature, which is traditionally classified into different types. No one argues that Deutero-Isaiah belongs to wisdom literature or that Job belongs to the genre of prophecy. Yet, if texts are only understood in this constant way, there may be little that the two different literary types themselves can tell us about similar theological ideas, because they are not generically similar except in terms of Hebrew poetry. On the contrary, the advantage in comparing biblical texts on the basis of significant scribal thoughts is that it could give us a real opportunity to consider the ideas of the scribal group in the texts.

Thirdly, the historical development within scribal culture could shed light on further intertextual study of the Hebrew Bible, mentioned earlier in this research. What we have confirmed in Chapter 1 is that 'intertextuality' involves cultural dialogue within the existent written or spoken texts where textuality reflects the cultural structure or common worldview out of which the texts were composed. So, the theory of 'intertextuality' may not refer to the simple links between specific texts or between books, but more likely involves recognising texts as the product of a cultural dialogue in a highly complex literary environment. It is one of the areas where interpreters have changed and replaced its meaning, but biblical scholarship needs to reconsider the original significance of intertextuality; though we may still use it to a limited extent. Thus, the process of understanding scribal culture indicated in this study is much closer to the original idea of Kristeva and her supporters, so that at some level what we are attempting to do here is a more convincing intertextual study than former studies which I have criticised.

Over all, scribal culture in which the literati could memorise, educate, and use their inherited oral-written texts could provide a useful tool for explaining vast interconnections with the Israelite and non-Israelite literatures. This study might resolve the old problems of an author-oriented approach and might help the traditional intra-biblical exegesis which is still valuable in biblical interpretation.

## Bibliography

- Ackroyd, Peter R. *Exile and Restoration: A Study of Hebrew Thought of the Sixth Century B.C.* OTL. London: SCM, 1968.
- Adams, Robert McCormick, and Carl H. Kraeling, eds. *City Invincible: A Symposium on Urbanization and Cultural Development in the Ancient Near East*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1960.
- Aitken, James K. "The Inevitability of Reading Job through Lamentations." Pages 204–15 in *Reading Job Intertextually*. NY: T&T Clark, 2013.
- Albertz, Rainer. "Darius in Place of Cyrus: The First Edition of Deutero-Isaiah (Isaiah 40.1-52.12) in 521 BCE." *JSOT* 27, no. 3 (2003): 371–83.
- . *Israel in Exile: The History and Literature of the Sixth Century B.C.E.* SBL 3. Atlanta: SBL, 2003.
- . *Weltschöpfung Und Menschenschöpfung : Untersucht Bei Deuterojesaja, Hiob Und in Den Psalmen*. Stuttgart: Calwer, 1974.
- Albrektson, Bertil. *History and the Gods: An Essay on the Idea of Historical Events as Divine Manifestations in the Ancient Near East and in Israel*. CB 1. Lund: Gleerup, 1967.
- . *Studies in the Text and Theology of the Book of Lamentations with a Critical Edition of the Peshitta Text*. Studia theologica Lundensia 21. Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1963.
- Allen, Graham. *Intertextuality*. 2nd ed. The New Critical Idiom. London: Routledge, 2011.
- Allen, James P. *The Debate Between a Man and His Soul: A Masterpiece of Ancient Egyptian Literature*. Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 44. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Allen, Leslie C. *Psalms 101-150*. WBC 21. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2002.
- Alonso Schökel, Luis. *A Manual of Hermeneutics*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Anderson, A. A. *2 Samuel*. WBC 11. Dallas, Tex: WBC, 1989.
- Anderson, Bernhard W. "Exodus and Covenant in Second Isaiah and Prophetic Tradition." Pages 339–60 in *Magnalia Dei, the Mighty Acts of God: Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Memory of G. Ernest Wright*. Edited by Frank Moore Cross, Werner E. Lemke, and Patrick D. Miller. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976.
- . "Exodus Typology in Second Isaiah." Pages 177–95 in *Israel's Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honour of James Muilenburg*. Edited by Bernhard W. Anderson and Walter J. Harrelson. London: SCM, 1962.
- André, Gunnel. "Deuterojesaja Och Jobsboken: En Jämförande Studie." *SEÅ* 54 (1989): 33–42.
- Annus, Amar, and Alan Lenzi. *Ludlul Bēl Nēmeqi: The Standard Babylonian Poem of the Righteous Sufferer*. SAACT 7. Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 2010.
- Assmann, Jan. *The Search for God in Ancient Egypt*. Ithaca; London: Cornell UP, 2001.
- Baines, John. "Literacy and Ancient Egyptian Society." *Man* 18, no. 3 (1983): 572–99.
- . "Society, Morality, and Religious Practice." *Religion in Ancient Egypt: Gods, Myths, and Personal Practice*. Edited by Byron E. Shafer. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1991.
- . *Visual and Written Culture in Ancient Egypt*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2009.
- Baines, John, and Elizabeth Froom. "Piety, Change and Display in the New Kingdom." Pages 1–17 in *Ramesside Studies in Honour of K.A. Kitchen*. Edited by Mark Collier and S. R. Snape. Bolton: Rutherford, 2011.
- Bakhtin, M. M. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Edited by Michael Holquist. University of Texas Press Slavic Series 1. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981.
- Bakon, Shimon. "Two Hymns to Wisdom: Proverbs 8 and Job 28." *JBQ* 36, no. 4 (2008): 222–30.
- Balentine, Samuel E. *Job*. SHBC 10. Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2006.
- . "Job and the Priests: 'He Leads Priests Away Stripped' (Job 12:19)." Pages 42–53 in *Reading Job Intertextually*. NY: T&T Clark, 2013.
- . "Job as Priest to the Priests." *Ex Auditu* 18 (2002): 29–52.
- Baltzer, Dieter. *Ezechiel Und Deuterojesaja: Berührungen in Der Heilserwartung Der Beiden Grossen Exilspropheten*. BZAW 121. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1971.
- Baltzer, Klaus. *Deutero-Isaiah: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.

- . “Schriftauslegung Bei Deuterjesaja? - Jes 43,22-28 Als Beispiel.” Pages 11–16 in *Väter Israels*. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1989.
- Barstad, Hans M. “On the So-Called Babylonian Literary Influence in Second Isaiah.” *SJOT*, no. 2 (1987): 90–110.
- . *The Babylonian Captivity of the Book of Isaiah: “Exilic” Judah and the Provenance of Isaiah 40-55*. Oslo: Novus, 1997.
- . *The Myth of the Empty Land: A Study in the History and Archaeology of Judah during the “Exilic” Period*. Oslo: Scandinavian UP, 1996.
- Barthes, Roland. *Image, Music, Text*. Translated by Stephen Heath. Fontana Communications Series. London: Fontana, 1977.
- . “Theory of the Text.” Pages 31–47 in *Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader*. Edited by Robert Young. Boston; London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981.
- Barton, John. *Amos’s Oracles against the Nations: A Study of Amos 1.3-2.5*. SOTSMS 6. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1980.
- . “Ethics in Isaiah of Jerusalem.” *JTS* 32, no. 1 (1981): 1–18.
- . “History and Rhetoric in the Prophets.” Pages 51–64 in *Bible as Rhetoric*. London: Routledge, 1990.
- . “Natural Law and Poetic Justice in the Old Testament.” *JTS* 30, no. 1 (1979): 1–14.
- . “The Basis of Ethics in the Hebrew Bible.” *Semeia*, no. 66 (1994): 11–22.
- . “Theological Ethics in Daniel.” Pages 661–70 in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*. Edited by John Joseph Collins and Peter W. Flint. Vol. 2. FIOTL. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Bastiaens, Jean Charles. “The Language of Suffering in Job 16-19 and in the Suffering Servant Passages in Deutero-Isaiah.” Pages 421–32 in *Studies in the Book of Isaiah*. Peeters: Leuven UP, 1997.
- . *Trito-Isaiah: An Exhaustive Concordance of Isa. 56-66, Especially with Reference to Deutero-Isaiah: An Example of Computer Assisted Research*. Amsterdam: VU Uitgeverij, 1984.
- Behr, Jacob William. *The Writings of Deutero-Isaiah and the Neo-Babylonian Royal Inscriptions: A Comparison of the Language and Style*. PUP III. Pretoria, South Africa: B. Rubinstein & Company, 1937.
- Ben Zvi, Ehud. “Prophetic Memories in the Deuteronomistic Historical and the Prophetic Collections of Books.” Pages 75–102 in *Israelite Prophecy and the Deuteronomistic History: Portrait, Reality, and the Formation of a History*. Edited by Mignon R. Jacobs and Raymond F. Person. SBL Ancient Israel and Its Literature 14. Atlanta: SBL, 2013.
- Ben Zvi, Ehud, and Michael H. Floyd, eds. *Writings and Speech in Israelite and Ancient Near Eastern Prophecy*. SBLSS 10. Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2000.
- Berger, Paul R. *Die Neubabylonischen Königsinschriften: Königsinschriften Des Ausgehenden Babylonischen Reiches (626-539 A. Chr.)*. AOAT Bd. 4/1. Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker, 1973.
- Bickerman, Elias J. “The Babylonian Captivity.” Pages 342–58 in *The Cambridge History of Judaism*. Edited by W. D. Davies and Louis Finkelstein. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984.
- Black, James Roger. “The Instruction of Amenemope: A Critical Edition and Commentary Prolegomenon and Prologue.” PhD, The University of Wisconsin, 2002.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *Isaiah 40-55: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 19A. NY: Doubleday, 2000.
- . *Isaiah 56-66: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 19B. NY: Doubleday, 2003.
- . *Sage, Priest, Prophet: Religious and Intellectual Leadership in Ancient Israel*. LAI. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1995.
- Block, Daniel Isaac. *The Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 1-24*. NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Blommerde, Anton C. M. *Northwest Semitic Grammar and Job*. BO 22. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969.

- Bolin, Thomas M. *Freedom beyond Forgiveness: The Book of Jonah Re-Examined*. JSOT 236. Sheffield: JSOT, 1997.
- Boorer, Suzanne. "A Matter of Life and Death: A Comparison of Proverbs 1-9 and Job." Pages 187–204 in *Prophets and Paradigms: Essays in Honor of Gene M. Tucker*. Edited by Stephen Breck Reid and Gene M. Tucker. JSOT 229. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Bovati, Pietro. *Re-Establishing Justice: Legal Terms, Concepts and Procedures in the Hebrew Bible*. JSOT 105. Sheffield: JSOT, 1994.
- Braullik, Georg. "Das Deuteronomium Und Die Bucher Ijob, Sprichwörter, Rut: Zur Frage Früher Kanonizität Des Deuteronomiums." Pages 61–138 in *Die Tora Als Kanon Für Juden Und Christen*. Edited by Erich Zenger. Herders biblische Studien. Freiburg im Br: Herder, 1996.
- Bresciani, Edda. "Egypt, Persian Satrapy." Pages 358–72 in *The Cambridge History of Judaism*. Edited by W. D. Davies and Louis Finkelstein. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984.
- Bricker, Daniel P. "Innocent Suffering in Egypt." *TB* 52, no. 1 (2001): 83–100.
- . "Innocent Suffering in Mesopotamia." *TB* 51, no. 2 (2000): 193–214.
- Brinks, C. L. "Job and Deutero Isaiah: The Use and Abuse of Traditions." *BI:AJCA* 20, no. 4–5 (2012): 407–20.
- . "The Thematic, Stylistic, and Verbal Similarities between Isaiah 40–55 and the Book of Job." PhD, University of Notre Dame, 2010.
- Brueggemann, Walter. *Isaiah 40–66*. Westminster Bible Companion. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1998.
- . "Isaiah 55 and Deuteronomical Theology." *ZAW* 80, no. 2 (1968): 191–203.
- . "Planned People/Planned Book." Pages 19–37 in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Bryce, Glendon E. *A Legacy of Wisdom: The Egyptian Contribution to the Wisdom of Israel*. Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, 1979.
- Burrell, David B., and Anthony H. Johns. *Deconstructing Theodicy: Why Job Has Nothing to Say to the Puzzle of Suffering*. Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2008.
- Buttenwieser, Moses. *The Psalms. Chronologically Treated, with a New Translation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938.
- Caquot, A. "גֵּעַר." *TDOT:III*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.
- Carr, David M. *An Introduction to the Old Testament: Sacred Texts and Imperial Contexts of the Hebrew Bible*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
- . "Method in Determination of Direction of Dependence." Pages 107–40 in *Gottes Volk Am Sinai : Untersuchungen Zu Ex 32–34 Und Dtn 9–10*. Edited by Matthias Köckert and Erhard Blum. Gütersloh: Chr. Kaiser, 2001.
- . *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible a New Reconstruction*. NY: Oxford UP, 2011.
- . "The Many Uses of Intertextuality." Pages 505–35 in *Congress Volume Helsinki 2010*. Edited by Martti Nissinen. SVT 148. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2012.
- . *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2005.
- Carroll, Robert P. *From Chaos to Covenant: Prophecy in the Book of Jeremiah*. NY: Crossroad, 1981.
- . *Jeremiah: A Commentary*. OTL. London: SCM, 1986.
- Cassuto, Umberto. "On the Formal and Stylistic Relationship between Deutero-Isaiah and Other Biblical Writers." Pages 141–77 in *Biblical and Oriental Studies*. Publications of the Perry Foundation for Biblical Research in the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1973.
- Ceresko, Anthony R. *Job 29–31 in the Light of Northwest Semitic: A Translation and Philological Commentary*. BO 36. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1980.
- Charpin, Dominique. *Reading and Writing in Babylon*. Translated by Jane Marie Todd. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2010.
- Chavasse, Claude Lionel. "Suffering Servant and Moses." *CQR* 165, no. 355 (1964): 152–63.
- Cheyne, T. K. *Job and Solomon: Or the Wisdom of the Old Testament*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1887.



- . *The Prophecies of Isaiah: A New Translation with Commentary and Appendices*. Vol. 2. London, 1884.
- Childs, Brevard S. *Isaiah*. Louisville, KY: John Knox Press, 2001.
- Clancy, Frank. "The Date of LXX." *SJOT* 16, no. 2 (2002): 207–25.
- Clements, Ronald E. "Beyond Tradition-History: Deutero-Isaianic Development of First Isaiah's Themes." *JSOT*, no. 31 (1985): 95–113.
- . "Monotheism and the God of Many Names." Pages 47–59 in *The God of Israel*. Edited by R. P. Gordon. UCOP 64. Cambridge; NY: Cambridge UP, 2007.
- . "The Davidic Covenant in the Isaiah Tradition." Pages 39–70 in *Covenant as Context: Essays in Honour of E.W. Nicholson*. Edited by A. D. H. Mayes and Robert B. Salters. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2003.
- Clifford, Hywel. "Deutero-Isaiah and Monotheism." Pages 267–89 in *Prophecy and Prophets in Ancient Israel Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*. Edited by John Day. NY: T&T Clark, 2010.
- Clifford, Richard J. *Creation Accounts in the Ancient Near East and in the Bible*. CBQ 26. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association, 1994.
- . "The Hebrew Scriptures and the Theology of Creation." *TS* 46, no. 3 (1985): 507–23.
- . "The Unity of the Book of Isaiah and Its Cosmogonic Language." *CBQ* 55, no. 1 (1993): 1–17.
- Clines, David J. A., ed. "DCH." Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993.
- . "Deconstructing the Book of Job." Pages 106–23 in *What Does Eve Do to Help?: And Other Readerly Questions to the Old Testament*. JSOT 94. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.
- . *I, He, We and They: A Literary Approach to Isaiah 53*. University of Sheffield, 1976.
- . *Job 1-20*. WBC 17. Dallas: Word Books, 1989.
- . *Job 21-37*. WBC 18A. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2006.
- . *Job 38-42*. WBC 18B. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2011.
- . "Job's Fifth Friend: An Ethical Critique of the Book of Job." *BI* 12, no. 3 (2004): 233–50.
- Coggins, Richard J. "An Alternative Prophetic Tradition." Pages 77–94 in *Israel's Prophetic Tradition*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge UP, 1982.
- Cohen, Yoram. *The Scribes and Scholars of the City of Emar in the Late Bronze Age*. HSS 59. IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009.
- Collins, John J. *Daniel: With an Introduction to Apocalyptic Literature*. The Forms of the Old Testament Literature 20. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1984.
- . "From Prophecy to Apocalypticism: The Expectation of the End." Edited by John J. Collins. *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism*. NY: Continuum, 2000.
- . *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. The biblical resource series. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.
- . *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel*. HSM no. 16. Missoula, Mont: Scholars, 1977.
- Conrad, Edgar W. *Reading Isaiah*. OBT 27. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
- Coogan, Michael David. "Life in the Diaspora: Jews at Nippur in the Fifth Century B.C." *BA* 37, no. 1 (1974): 6–12.
- Cook, Stephen L., Corrine Patton, James W. Watts, and Jane Morse, eds. *The Whirlwind: Essays on Job, Hermeneutics and Theology in Memory of Jane Morse*. JSOT 336. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Cooper, Alan. "The Suffering Servant and Job: A View from the Sixteenth Century." Pages 189–200 in *As Those Who Are Taught*. Atlanta: SBL, 2006.
- Corley, Jeremy. *Sirach*. NCoBC 21. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 2013.
- Craigie, Peter C. "Job and Ugaritic Studies." Pages 28–35 in *Studies in the Book of Job*. Edited by Walter Emanuel Aufrecht. Wilfrid Laurier UP, 1985.
- Craigie, Peter C., Page H. Kelley, and Joel F. Drinkard. *Jeremiah 1-25*. WBC 26. Dallas: Word Books, 1991.
- Creach, Jerome. "The Shape of Book Four of the Psalter and the Shape of Second Isaiah." *JSOT*, no. 80 (1998): 63–76.

- Crenshaw, James L. *Defending God: Biblical Responses to the Problem of Evil*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2005.
- . “Divine Discipline in Job 5:17-18, Proverbs 3:11-12, Deuteronomy 32:39, and Beyond.” Pages 176–89 in *Reading Job Intertextually*. NY: T&T Clark, 2013.
- . *Education in Ancient Israel: Across the Deadening Silence*. ABRL. NY: Doubleday, 1998.
- . “In Search of Divine Presence : Some Remarks Preliminary to a Theology of Wisdom.” *RE* 74, no. 3 (1977): 353–69.
- . *Old Testament Wisdom: An Introduction*. 3rd ed. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2010.
- . “Popular Questioning of the Justice of God in Ancient Israel.” *ZAW* 82, no. 3 (1970): 380–95.
- . *Reading Job: A Literary and Theological Commentary*. Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys Publication, 2011.
- . “The Influence of the Wise upon Amos: The Doxologies of Amos and Job 5:9-16, 9:5-10.” *ZAW* 79, no. 1 (1967): 42–52.
- . “Theodicy and Prophetic Literature.” Pages 236–55 in *Theodicy in the World of the Bible*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- . “The Shift from Theodicy to Anthropodicy.” Pages 1–16 in *Theodicy in the Old Testament*. Edited by James L. Crenshaw. IRT 4. Philadelphia: London: Fortress; SPCK, 1983.
- . “Transmitting Prophecy across Generations.” Pages 31–44 in *Writings and Speech in Israelite and Ancient Near Eastern Prophecy*. Edited by Ehud Ben Zvi and Michael H. Floyd. SBLSS no. 10. Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2000.
- Curtis, John B. “Elihu and Deutero-Isaiah: A Study in Literary Dependence.” Pages 31–38 in *Proceedings, Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Societies*. Vol. 10. Cincinnati: Eastern Great Lakes & Midwest Biblical Societies, 1990.
- Dahood, Mitchell Joseph. “Some Northwest Semitic Words in Job.” *Biblica* 38, no. 3 (1957): 306–20.
- . “Some Rare Parallel Word Pairs in Job and in Ugaritic.” Pages 19–34 in *Word in the World*. Massachusetts: Weston College, 1973.
- Davidson, Robert. “Universalism in Second Isaiah.” *SJT* 16, no. 02 (1963): 166–85.
- Davies, Graham I. “The Destiny of the Nations in the Book of Isaiah.” Pages 93–120 in *Book of Isaiah- Le Livre d’Isaie*. Louvain: Leuven UP, 1989.
- Davies, John A. “Theodicy.” Pages 60–63 in *DOTWPW*. IVP, 2008.
- Davies, Philip R. “‘Pen of Iron, Point of Diamond’ (Jer 17:1): Prophecy as Writing.” Pages 65–81 in *Writings and Speech in Israelite and Ancient Near Eastern Prophecy*. Edited by Ehud Ben Zvi and Michael H. Floyd. SBLSS no. 10. Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2000.
- . *Scribes and Schools: The Canonization of the Hebrew Scriptures*. LAI. London: SPCK, 1998.
- . “The Audiences of Prophetic Scrolls: Some Suggestions.” Pages 48–62 in *Prophets and Paradigms: Essays in Honor of Gene M. Tucker*. Edited by Stephen Breck Reid. JSOT 229. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Davis, Ellen F. “Job and Jacob: The Integrity of Faith.” Pages 100–120 in *The Whirlwind*. JSOT 336. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Day, John. “God and Leviathan in Isaiah 27:1.” *BS* 155, no. 620 (1998): 423–36.
- . *God’s Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea: Echoes of a Canaanite Myth in the Old Testament*. University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 35. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1985.
- Dearman, J. Andrew. “On Writing and Reciting in Jeremiah 36.” *JBL* 109, no. 3 (1990): 403–21.
- Dell, Katharine J. “‘Cursed Be the Day I Was Born!’: Job and Jeremiah Revisited.” Pages 106–17 in *Reading Job Intertextually*. NY: T&T Clark, 2013.
- . “Hosea, Creation, and Wisdom. An Alternative Tradition.” Pages 409–24 in *On Stone and Scroll*. Edited by James K. Aitken. Vol. 420. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, 2011.
- . *The Book of Job as Sceptical Literature*. BZAW 197. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1991.

- . “The Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah: Jeremiah Revisited.” Pages 119–34 in *Genesis, Isaiah, and Psalms*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Dell, Katharine J., and Will Kynes, eds. *Reading Job Intertextually*. LHB/OTS 574. NY: T&T Clark, 2013.
- Deming, Lynne M. “Hymnic Language in Deutero-Isaiah: The Calls to Praise and Their Function in the Book.” PhD, Emory University, 1978.
- Demsky, Aaron. “On the Extent of Literacy in Ancient Israel.” Pages 349–53 in *Biblical Archaeology Today: Proceedings of the International Congress on Biblical Archaeology Jerusalem, April 1984*. Edited by Janet Amitai. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1985.
- . “Scribe.” Edited by Fred Skolnik and Michael Berenbaum. *Encyclopaedia Judaica*. Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA in association with Keter Publishing House, 2007.
- Denning-Bolle, Sara. *Wisdom in Akkadian Literature: Expression, Instruction, Dialogue*. Mededelingen en verhandelingen van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap “Ex Oriente Lux” 28. Leiden: Ex Oriente Lux, 1992.
- Dhorme, E. *A Commentary on the Book of Job*. Translated by H. Knight. London: Nelson, 1967.
- Dick, Michael B. “Legal Metaphor in Job 31.” *CBQ* 41, no. 1 (1979): 37–50.
- Dijkstra, Meindert. *Gods Voorstelling: Predikatieve Expressie van Zelfopenbaring in Oudoosterse Teksten En Deutero-Jesaja*. Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1980.
- . “Lawsuit, Debate and Wisdom Discourse in Second Isaiah.” Pages 251–71 in *Studies in the Book of Isaiah*. Louvain: Leuven UP, 1997.
- Dion, Hyacinthe M. “Le Genre Littéraire Sumérien de L’‘hymne À Soi-Même’ et Quelques Passages Du Deutéro-Isaie.” *RB* 74, no. 2 (1967): 215–34.
- . “Patriarchal Traditions and the Literary Form of the ‘Oracle of Salvation.’” *CBQ* 29, no. 2 (1967): 198–206.
- Dobbs-Allsopp, F. W. *Weep, O Daughter of Zion: A Study of the City-Lament Genre in the Hebrew Bible*. BO 44. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1993.
- Douglas, Mary. *Leviticus as Literature*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999.
- Driver, S. R. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Job*. Edited by George Buchanan Gray. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1964.
- Eakins, Joel Kenneth. “Ezekiel’s Influence on the Exilic Isaiah.” ThD, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1970.
- Efron, John M. *The Jews: A History*. Upper Saddle River, NJ; London: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2009.
- Eissfeldt, Otto. “Promises of Grace to David in Isaiah 55:1-5.” Pages 196–207 in *Israel’s Prophetic Heritage; Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg*. NY: Harper, 1962.
- Elliott, Ralph. “A Comparative Study of Deutero Isaiah and Job.” PhD, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1956.
- Emerton, John A. “Leviathan and Ltn : The Vocalization of the Ugaritic Word for the Dragon.” *VT* 32, no. 3 (1982): 326–31.
- Eslinger, Lyle M. “Inner-Biblical Exegesis and Inner-Biblical Allusion: The Question of Category.” *VT* 42, no. 1 (1992): 47–58.
- Eyre, Christopher. *The Use of Documents in Pharaonic Egypt*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2013.
- Farley, F. A. “Jeremiah and ‘The Suffering Servant of Jehovah’ in Deutero-Jsaiah.” *ET* 38, no. 11 (1927): 521–24.
- Feinberg, Charles Lee. “The Poetic Structure of the Book of Job and the Ugaritic Literature.” *BS* 103, no. 411 (1946): 283–92.
- Ferris, Paul Wayne. *The Genre of Communal Lament in the Bible and the Ancient Near East*. SBLDS 127. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Fichtner, Johannes. “Isaiah among the Wise.” Pages 429–38 in *Studies in Ancient Israelite Wisdom*. Edited by James L. Crenshaw. LBS. NY: Ktav, 1976.
- . “Jahves Plan in Der Botschaft Des Jesaja.” *ZAW* 63, no. 1–2 (1951): 16–33.
- Fishbane, Michael A. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.
- . “Jeremiah IV 23-26 and Job III 3-13: A Recovered Use of the Creation Pattern.” *VT* 21, no. 2 (1971): 151–67.

- . *Text and Texture: Close Readings of Selected Biblical Texts*. NY: Schocken Books, 1979.
- . “Types of Biblical Intertextuality.” Pages 39–44 in *Congress Volume: Oslo 1998*. SVT 80. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Floyd, Michael H. “Prophecy and Writing in Habakkuk 2,1-5.” *ZAW* 105, no. 3 (1994): 462–81.
- Fohrer, Georg. *Das Buch Hiob*. 1. Aufl. KAT Bd. 16. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus G. Mohn, 1963.
- Foster, Benjamin R. *BM*. 3rd ed. Bethesda, MD: CDL, 2005.
- Frevel, Christian. “Telling the Secrets of Wisdom: The Use of Psalm 104 in the Book of Job.” Pages 157–68 in *Reading Job Intertextually*. NY: T&T Clark, 2013.
- Fyall, Robert S. *Now My Eyes Have Seen You: Images of Creation and Evil in the Book of Job*. Leicester: IVP, 2002.
- Gammie, John G., and Leo G. Perdue, eds. *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Gemser, B. “The Rib- or Controversy Pattern in Hebrew Mentality.” Pages 120–37 in *Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East: Presented to Professor Harold Henry Rowley by the Society for Old Testament Study, in Association with the Editorial Board of Vetus Testamentum, in Celebration of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday, 24 March 1955*. SVT 3. Leiden: Brill, 1955.
- Gerstenberger, Erhard. *Israel in the Persian Period: The Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.E.* Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- . “Persian-Empire Spirituality and the Genesis of Prophetic Books.” Pages 111–30 in *The Production of Prophecy: Constructing Prophecy and Prophets in Yehud*. Edited by Diana Vikander Edelman and Ehud Ben Zvi. BibleWorld. London: Equinox, 2009.
- Gibson, John C. L. *Canaanite Myths and Legends*. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1978.
- Ginsberg, H. L. “A Strand in the Cord of Hebraic Hymnody.” Pages 45–50 in *W. F. Albright Volume*. Jerusalem: Jerusalem Exploration Society, 1969.
- . “The Arm of YHWH in Isaiah 51-63 and the Text of Isa 53:10-11.” *JBL* 77, no. 2 (1958): 152–56.
- Gnuse, Robert Karl. *Heilsgeschichte as a Model for Biblical Theology: The Debate Concerning the Uniqueness and Significance of Israel’s Worldview*. CTSSR 4. Lanham, MD; London: UP of America, 1989.
- Goldingay, John. *Daniel*. WBC 30. Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1989.
- . *Isaiah 40-55: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*. Edited by David Payne. ICC 1. London: T&T Clark, 2006.
- . *Isaiah 40-55: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*. Edited by David Payne. ICC 2. London: T&T Clark, 2006.
- . *The Message of Isaiah 40-55: A Literary-Theological Commentary*. London: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Golka, Friedemann W. “The Israelite School or ‘The Emperor’s New Cloths.’” Pages 4–15 in *The Leopard’s Spots: Biblical and African Wisdom in Proverbs*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993.
- Gordis, Robert. “Quotations as a Literary Usage in Biblical, Oriental and Rabbinic Literature.” *HUCA* 22 (1949): 157–219.
- . *The Book of God and Man: A Study of Job*. Phoenix ed. Chicago; London: University of Chicago, 1978.
- . *The Book of Job: Commentary, New Translation and Special Studies*. Moreshet Series: Studies in Jewish History, Literature and Thought 2. NY: JTSA, 1978.
- Gottwald, Norman K. *Studies in the Book of Lamentations*. SBT 14. London: SCM, 1954.
- Grabbe, Lester L. *A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period*. LSTS 47. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- . *Comparative Philology and the Text of Job: A Study in Methodology*. SBLDS 34. Missoula, Montana: Scholars, 1977.
- . *Ezra-Nehemiah*. Old Testament Readings. London: Routledge, 1998.
- . *Introduction to Second Temple Judaism: History and Religion of the Jews in the Time of Nehemiah, the Maccabees, Hillel, and Jesus*. US: T&T Clark, 2010.

- . “The ‘Persian Documents’ in the Book of Ezra: Are They Authentic?.” Pages 531–70 in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*. IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006.
- . “What Was Ezra’s Mission?” Pages 286–99 in *Second Temple Studies: 2. Temple Community in the Persian Period*. Edited by Tamara C. Eskenazi and Kent Harold Richards. JSOT 117. Sheffield: JSOT, 1991.
- Gray, John. “Book of Job in the Context of Near Eastern Literature.” *ZAW* 82, no. 2 (1970): 251–69.
- . *The Book of Job*. Edited by David J. A. Clines. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2010.
- Grayson, Albert Kirk. *Assyrian Royal Inscriptions*. Records of the Ancient Near East. Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz, 1972.
- Green, Douglas J. “The Good, the Bad and the Better: Psalm 23 and Job.” Pages 69–83 in *The Whirlwind*. JSOT 336. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Greenstein, Edward L. “A Forensic Understanding of the Speech from the Whirlwind.” Pages 241–58 in *Texts, Temples, and Traditions*. IN: Eisenbrauns, 1996.
- . “Jeremiah as an Inspiration to the Poet of Job.” Pages 98–110 in *Inspired Speech: Prophecy in the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of Herbert B. Huffmon*. Edited by John Kaltner and Louis Stulman. JSOT. London; NY: T&T Clark, 2004.
- . “Parody as a Challenge to Tradition: The Use of Deuteronomy 32 in the Book of Job.” Pages 66–78 in *Reading Job Intertextually*. NY: T&T Clark, 2013.
- Green, William Scott. “Stretching the Covenant: Job and Judaism.” *RE* 99, no. 4 (2002): 569–77.
- Greßmann, Hugo. “Die Literarische Analyse Deuteronesias.” *ZAW* 34, no. 4 (1914).
- Griffiths, John Gwyn. *The Divine Verdict: A Study of Divine Judgement in the Ancient Religions*. SHR 52. Leiden: Brill, 1991.
- Gunkel, Hermann. *Die Israelitische Literatur*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963.
- . *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit : eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung über Gen 1 und Ap Joh 12*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1895.
- . “The Literature of Ancient Israel by Hermann Gunkel: Introduced and Translated by Armin Siedlecki.” Pages 26–83 in *Relating to the Text Interdisciplinary and Form-Critical Insights on the Bible*. Edited by Timothy J. Sandoval, Carleen Mandolfo, and Martin J. Buss. JSOT 384. London; NY: T&T Clark, 2003.
- Gunn, David M. “Deutero-Isaiah and the Flood.” *JBL* 94, no. 4 (1975): 493–508.
- Gwaltney, William. “The Biblical Book of Lamentations in the Context of Near Eastern Literature.” Pages 191–211 in *Scripture in Context II : More Essays on the Comparative Method*. Edited by William W. Hallo, James C. Moyer, and Leo G. Perdue. IN: Eisenbrauns, 1983.
- Habel, Norman C. “He Who Stretches out the Heavens.” *CBQ* 34, no. 4 (1972): 417–30.
- Hahn, Scott. “Covenant in the Old and New Testaments: Some Current Research (1994-2004).” *CBR* 3, no. 2 (2005): 263–92.
- . *Kinship by Covenant: A Canonical Approach to the Fulfillment of God’s Saving Promises*. The Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library. New Haven: Yale UP, 2009.
- Hallo, William W., ed. *The Context of Scripture*. Vol. I. Leiden; NY; Köln: Brill, 1997.
- , ed. *The Context of Scripture*. Vol. III. Leiden; NY; Köln: Brill, 2002.
- , ed. *The Context of Scripture*. Vol. II. Leiden; NY; Köln: Brill, 2000.
- Handy, Lowell K. “The Authorization of Divine Power and the Guilt of God in the Book of Job : Useful Ugaritic Parallels.” *JSOT*, no. 60 (1993): 107–18.
- Hanson, Paul D. *The Dawn of Apocalyptic: The Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.
- Haran, Menahem. “On the Diffusion of Literacy and Schools in Ancient Israel.” *VTSup* 40 (1988): 81–95.
- Harner, Philip B. “Salvation Oracle in Second Isaiah.” *JBL* 88, no. 4 (1969): 418–34.
- Hartley, John E. *The Book of Job*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1988.
- Heckl, Raik. *Hiob -- Vom Gottesfürchtigen Zum Repräsentanten Israels: Studien Zur Buchwerdung Des Hiobbuches Und Zu Seinen Quellen*. FAT. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

- . “The Relationship between Job 1-2, 42 and 1 Samuel 1-4.” Pages 81–93 in *Reading Job Intertextually*. NY: T&T Clark, 2013.
- Hobbs, T. R. *2 Kings*. WBC 13. Waco, Tex: Word Books, 1985.
- Holladay, William L. *Jeremiah 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Chapters 1-25*. Edited by Paul D. Hanson. Hermeneia--A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.
- . *Jeremiah 2: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Chapters 26-52*. Edited by Paul D. Hanson. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.
- Hurvitz, Avi. *A Concise Lexicon of Late Biblical Hebrew: Linguistic Innovations in the Writings of the Second Temple Period*. SVT 160. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2014.
- . “Can Biblical Texts Be Dated Linguistically? Chronological Perspectives in the Historical Study of Biblical Hebrew.” Pages 143–60 in *Congress Volume: Oslo 1998*. Edited by André Lemaire and Magne Sæbø. SVT 80. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2000.
- . “Date of the Prose-Tale of Job Linguistically Reconsidered.” *HTR* 67, no. 1 (1974): 17–34.
- Hyatt, James Philip. “The Writing of an Old Testament Book.” *BA* 6, no. 4 (1943): 71–80.
- Illman, Karl-Johan. “Theodicy in Job.” Pages 304–33 in *Theodicy in the World of the Bible*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Isbell, Charles D. “2 Kings 22:3-23:24 and Jeremiah 36: A Stylistic Comparison.” *JSOT*, no. 8 (1978): 33–45.
- Jamieson-Drake, David W. *Scribes and Schools in Monarchic Judah: A Socio-Archeological Approach*. JSOTSup 109. Sheffield: JSOT, 1991.
- Janzen, J. Gerald. “An Echo of the Shema in Isaiah 51:1-3.” *JSOT*, no. 43 (1989): 69–82.
- . “Another Look at God’s Watch over Job (7:12).” *JBL* 108, no. 1 (1989): 109–14.
- . “Creation and the Human Predicament in Job.” *Ex Auditu* 3 (1987): 45–53.
- . “On the Moral Nature of God’s Power: Yahweh and the Sea in Job and Deutero-Isaiah.” *CBQ* 56, no. 3 (1994): 458–78.
- Jensen, Joseph. “Yahweh’s Plan in Isaiah and in the Rest of the Old Testament.” *CBQ* 48, no. 3 (1986): 443–55.
- Jones, Gwilym H. “Abraham and Cyrus: Type and Anti-Type?” *VT* 22, no. 3 (1972): 304–19.
- Jong, Matthijs J. de. *Isaiah among the Ancient Near Eastern Prophets: A Comparative Study of the Earliest Stages of the Isaiah Tradition and the Neo-Assyrian Prophecies*. SVT 117. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Joosten, Jan. “Linguistic Clues as to the Date of the Book of Job: A Mediating Position.” Pages 347–57 in *Interested Readers*. Atlanta: SBL, 2013.
- Joyce, Paul M. “‘Even If Noah, Daniel, and Job Were in It...’ (Ezekiel 14:14): The Case of Job and Ezekiel.” Pages 118–28 in *Reading Job Intertextually*. NY: T&T Clark, 2013.
- Juvan, Marko. “Towards a History of Intertextuality in Literary and Culture Studies.” *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 10, no. 3 (2008): 1–10.
- Kaminsky, Joel S., and Anne Stewart. “God of All the World: Universalism and Developing Monotheism in Isaiah 40-66.” *HTR* 99, no. 2 (2006): 139–63.
- Kapellrud, Arvid S. “The Date of the Priestly Code (P).” *ASTI* III (1964): 58–64.
- Kaufmann, Yehezkel. *The Religion of Israel: From Its Beginnings to the Babylonian Exile*. Translated by Moshe Greenberg. London: Allen & Unwin, 1961.
- Keown, Gerald L., Pamela J. Scalise, and Thomas G. Smothers. *Jeremiah 26-52*. WBC 27. Dallas: Word Books, 1995.
- Kim, Dong-Hyuk. *Early Biblical Hebrew, Late Biblical Hebrew, and Linguistic Variability: A Sociolinguistic Evaluation of the Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts*. SVT 156. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2013.
- Kittel, R. “Cyrus Und Deuteriojesaja.” *ZAW* 18, no. 1 (1898): 149–62.
- Knibb, Michael. “The Book of Daniel in Its Context.” Pages 16–35 in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*. Edited by John Joseph Collins and Peter W. Flint. Vol. 1. FIOTL. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Knohl, Israel. *The Divine Symphony: The Bible’s Many Voices*. Philadelphia: JPS, 2003.
- . *The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School*. IN: Eisenbrauns, 2007.

- Knoppers, Gary N. "Ancient Near Eastern Royal Grants and the Davidic Covenant: A Parallel?" *JAOS* 116, no. 4 (1996): 670–97.
- Koehl-Krebs, H. "L'intertextualité Comme Méthode D'investigation Du Texte Biblique: L'exemple de Malachie 3,20." *BN* 121 (2004): 61–76.
- Kooij, Arie van der. "The Concept of Covenant (berît) in the Book of Daniel." Pages 495–501 in *Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings*. Louvain: Leuven UP, 1993.
- Koole, Jan Leunis. *Isaiah Part III Vol 1: Isaiah 40-48*. HCOT. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1997.
- . *Isaiah Part III Vol 2: Isaiah 49-55*. HCOT. Leuven: Peeters, 1998.
- Kramer, S. N. "'Man and His God': A Sumerian Variation on 'Job' Motif." Pages 170–82 in *Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East: Presented to Professor Harold Henry Rowley*. Edited by Martin Noth and David Winton Thomas. SVT 3. Leiden: Brill, 1955.
- Kraus, Hans-Joachim. *Psalms 60-150: A Commentary*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. Edited by Leon Samuel Roudiez. Oxford: Blackwell, 1982.
- . *Revolution in Poetic Language*. NY: Columbia UP, 1984.
- Krüger, Annette. *Das Lob des Schöpfers : Studien zu Sprache, Motivik und Theologie von Psalm 104*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2010.
- Krüger, Thomas. "Reading Ecclesiastes Intertextually - Ecclesiastes and Job." Amsterdam, 2012.
- Krüger, Thomas, Manfred Oeming, Konrad Schmid, and Christoph Uehlinger, eds. *Das Buch Hiob Und Seine Interpretationen: Beiträge Zum Hiob-Symposium Auf Dem Monte Verità Vom 14.-19. August 2005*. ATANT. Zürich: TVZ, 2007.
- Kuhrt, Amélie. "The Cyrus Cylinder and Achaemenid Imperial Policy." *JSOT*, no. 25 (1983): 83–97.
- Kynes, Will. "Job and Isaiah 40-55: Intertextualities in Dialogue." Pages 94–105 in *Reading Job Intertextually*. LHB/OTS. NY: T&T Clark, 2013.
- . *My Psalm Has Turned into Weeping: Job's Dialogue with the Psalms*. BZAW 437. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 2012.
- . "My Psalm Has Turned into Weeping: The Dialogical Intertextuality of Allusions to the Psalms in Job." PhD, University of Cambridge, 2011.
- Laato, Antti. *The Servant of YHWH and Cyrus: A Reinterpretation of the Exilic Messianic Programme in Isaiah 40-55*. CB 35. Stockholm: Almqvist&Wiksell, 1992.
- Laato, Antti, and Johannes Cornelis de Moor. "Introduction." Pages vii – liv in *Theodicy in the World of the Bible*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Labov, William. *Principles of Linguistic Change*. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Language in Society 20. Oxford: Blackwell, 1994.
- Lambert, W. G. *BWL*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960.
- . "Destiny and Divine Intervention in Babylon and Israel." Pages 65–72 in *Witness of Tradition*. Leiden: Brill, 1972.
- Langdon, Stephen Herbert. *Building Inscriptions of the Neo-Babylonian Empire*. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1905.
- Van Leeuwen, Raymond C. "Scribal Wisdom and Theodicy in the Book of the Twelve." Pages 31–49 in *In Search of Wisdom*. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993.
- . "The Sage in the Prophetic Literature." Pages 295–306 in *Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Lemaire, André. *Les Écoles et La Formation de La Bible Dans L'ancien Israël*. Orbis biblicus et orientalis 39. Fribourg, Suisse: Editions universitaires; Göttingen, 1981.
- Leonard, J. M. "Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusions: Psalm 78 as a Test Case." *JBL* 127 (2008): 241–65.
- Lévêque, Jean. *Job et Son Dieu: Essai D'exégèse et de Théologie Biblique*. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1970.
- . "La Datation Du Livre de Job." Pages 206–19 in *Congress Volume: Vienna, 1980*. Edited by John Adney Emerton. SVT v. 32. Leiden: Brill, 1981.
- Lichtheim, Miriam. *AEL*. Vol. 1. Berkeley: University of California, 1973.
- . *AEL*. Vol. 3. Berkeley: University of California, 1980.
- Linafelt, Tod. "Surviving Lamentations." *HBT* 17, no. 1 (1995): 45–61.

- . *Surviving Lamentations: Catastrophe, Lament, and Protest in the Afterlife of a Biblical Book*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Lindblom, Johannes. "Wisdom in the Old Testament Prophets." Pages 192–204 in *Wisdom in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Presented to Harold Henry Rowley by the Editorial Board of "Vetus Testamentum" in Celebration of His 65th Birthday, March 1955*. Edited by Martin Noth and D. Winton Thomas. Brill, 1969.
- Lindenberger, James M. *The Aramaic Proverbs of Ahiqar*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1983.
- Lind, Millard C. "Monotheism, Power, and Justice: A Study in Isaiah 40-55." *CBQ* 46, no. 3 (1984): 432–46.
- Lipiński, Edward. "Royal and State Scribes in Ancient Jerusalem." Pages 157–64 in *Congress Volume*. Leiden: Brill, 1988.
- Longman III, Tremper. *Job*. Baker Commentary on the Old Testament Wisdom and Psalms. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012.
- Loprieno, Antonio. "Theodicy in Ancient Egyptian Texts." Pages 27–56 in *Theodicy in the World of the Bible*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Ludwig, Theodore M. "Traditions of the Establishing of the Earth in Deutero-Isaiah." *JBL* 92, no. 3 (1973): 345–57.
- Lundbom, Jack R. *Jeremiah 1-20: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 21A. NY: Doubleday, 1999.
- . *Jeremiah 21-36: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 21B. NY: Doubleday, 2004.
- MacDonald, Nathan. "Monotheism and Isaiah." Pages 43–61 in *Interpreting Isaiah*. Nottingham: Apollos, 2009.
- . "The Origin of 'Monotheism.'" Pages 204–15 in *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*. ECC 263. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Macintosh, A. A. "Hosea and the Wisdom Tradition: Dependence and Independence." Pages 124–32 in *Wisdom in Ancient Israel*. Edited by John Day. Cambridge University, 1998.
- Mack, R. Russell. "Neo-Assyrian Prophecy and the Hebrew Bible: A Comparative Analysis." PhD, Hebrew Union College, 2010.
- Magdalene, F. Rachel. *On the Scales of Righteousness Neo-Babylonian Trial Law and the Book of Job*. Providence, Rhode Island: Brown Judaic Studies, 2007.
- . "The ANE Legal Origins of Impairment as Theological Disability and the Book of Job." *PRS* 34, no. 1 (2007): 23–59.
- Mandolfo, Carleen. *Daughter Zion Talks back to the Prophets: A Dialogic Theology of the Book of Lamentations*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Marlow, Hilary. "Creation Themes in Job and Amos: An Intertextual Relationship?" Pages 142–54 in *Reading Job Intertextually*. NY: T&T Clark, 2013.
- Matthews, Victor Harold, and Don C. Benjamin. *OTP*. NY: Paulist, 1991.
- McKane, William. *Prophets and Wise Men*. London: Trinity, 1984.
- McKenzie, John L. *Second Isaiah*. AB 20. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1968.
- McKenzie, Steven L. "The Typology of the Davidic Covenant." Pages 152–78 in *Land That I Will Show You*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001.
- Meier, Sam. "Job 1-2: A Reflection of Genesis 1-3." *VT* 39, no. 2 (1989): 183–93.
- Melugin, Roy F. "Deutero-Isaiah and Form Criticism." *VT* 21, no. 3 (1971): 326–37.
- . *The Formation of Isaiah 40-55*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1976.
- Merrill, Eugene H. "Isaiah 40-55 as Anti-Babylonian Polemic." *GTJ* 8, no. 1 (1987): 3–18.
- . "The Language and Literary Characteristics of Isaiah 40-55 as Anti-Babylonian Polemic." PhD, Columbia University, 1984.
- Merwe, Barend Jacobus van der. *Pentateuchtradities in Die Prediking van Deuterojsaja: With a Summary in English*. Groningen: J. B. Wolters, 1955.
- Mettinger, Tryggve N. D. "In Search of the Hidden Structure: YHWH as King in Isaiah 40-55." *SEA* 51 (1986): 148–57.
- . "Intertextuality: Allusion and Vertical Context Systems in Some Job Passages." Pages 257–80 in *Of Prophets' Visions and the Wisdom of Sages: Essays in Honour of R. Norman Whybray on His Seventieth Birthday*. Edited by Heather A. McKay and David J. A. Clines. JSOT. Sheffield: JSOT, 1993.



- . *Solomonic State Officials: A Study of the Civil Government Officials of the Israelite Monarchy*. Gleeup, 1971.
- Michel, Walter Ludwig. *Job in the Light of Northwest Semitic*. BO 42. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1987.
- Millard, Alan R. "An Assessment of the Evidence for Writing in Ancient Israel." Pages 301–12 in *Biblical Archaeology Today: Proceedings of the International Congress on Biblical Archaeology Jerusalem, April 1984*. Edited by Janet Amitai. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1985.
- . "Literacy: Ancient Israel." Pages 337–40 in *ABD*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. Vol. 4. NY: Doubleday, 1992.
- Miller, Geoffrey David. "Intertextuality in Old Testament Research." *CBR* 9, no. 3 (2011): 283–309.
- Mintz, Alan L. *Hurban: Responses to Catastrophe in Hebrew Literature*. NY: Columbia UP, 1984.
- Moberly, R. W. L. "How Appropriate Is 'Monotheism' as a Category for Biblical Interpretation?." Pages 216–34 in *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*. ECC 263. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- . "Is Monotheism Bad for You?: Some Reflections on God, the Bible, and Life in the Light of Regina Schwartz's the Curse of Cain." Pages 94–112 in *The God of Israel*. Edited by R. P. Gordon. UCOP 64. Cambridge; NY: Cambridge UP, 2007.
- Moor, Johannes C. de. "Ugarit and the Origin of Job." Pages 225–57 in *Ugarit and the Bible*. Münster: Ugarit-Vorlag, 1994.
- Morgan, Donn F. *Wisdom in the Old Testament Traditions*. Atlanta: John Knox, 1981.
- Morgenstern, Julian. "Deutero-Isaiah's Terminology for 'Universal God.'" *JBL* 62, no. 4 (1943): 269–80.
- Mulder, M. J., and Aaron Demsky, eds. "Writing in Ancient Israel and Early Judaism: Part One: The Biblical Period." Pages 2–20 in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading & Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism & Early Christianity*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2004.
- Murphy, Roland E. "Wisdom and Creation." *JBL* 104, no. 1 (1985): 3–11.
- Myers, Jacob M. *Ezra, Nehemiah*. AB 14. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1965.
- Newsom, Carol A. "Job." *The New Interpreter's Bible: 1&2 Maccabees, Job, Psalms*. NIB 4. Abingdon Press, 1997.
- Nicholson, Ernest W., ed. *The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah, Chapters 26-52*. London: Cambridge UP, 1975.
- . "The Limits of Theodicy as a Theme of the Book of Job." Pages 71–82 in *Wisdom in Ancient Israel*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge UP, 1995.
- Niditch, Susan. *Oral World and Written Word: Ancient Israelite Literature*. London: SPCK, 1997.
- Niehaus, Jeffrey J. "Covenant: An Idea in the Mind of God." *JETS* 52, no. 2 (2009): 225–46.
- Niehr, H. "סֵפֶר." *TDOT:X*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.
- Nissinen, Martti. *Prophets and Prophecy in the Ancient Near East*. Edited by Peter Machinist. WAW 12. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2003.
- . *References to Prophecy in Neo-Assyrian Sources*. State archives of Assyria studies. Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 1998.
- Nogalski, James D. "Job and Joel: Divergent Voice on a Common Theme." Pages 129–41 in *Reading Job Intertextually*. NY: T&T Clark, 2013.
- North, C. R. *The Second Isaiah: Introduction, Translation and Commentary to Chapters XL-LV*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964.
- . *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah: An Historical and Critical Study*. 2nd ed. London: Oxford UP, 1956.
- Nougayrol, Jean. *Ugaritica 5: Nouveaux Textes Accadiens, Hourrites et Ugaritiques Des Archives et Bibliothèques Privées d'Ugarit, Commentaires Des Textes Historiques (première Partie)*. Mission de Ras Shamra t. 16. Paris: Geuthner, 1968.
- . "Une Version Ancienne Du 'Juste Souffrant.'" *RB* 59, no. 2 (1952): 239–50.

- Nurmela, Risto. *The Mouth of the Lord Has Spoken: Inner-Biblical Allusions in Second and Third Isaiah*. Studies in Judaism. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2006.
- O'Connor, Daniel. "The Keret Legend and the Prologue-Epilogue of Job." *ITQ* 55, no. 3 (1989): 1–6.
- O'Dowd, Ryan. "Creation Imagery." Pages 60–63 in *DOTWPW*. IVP, 2008.
- Oeming, Manfred. "Hiob 31 Und Der Dekalog." Pages 362–68 in *The Book of Job*. Edited by W. A. M. Beuken. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium. Louvain: Peeters, 1994.
- . "Hiob Monolog-Der Weg Nach Innen." Pages 57–75 in *Hiobs Weg: Stationen von Menschen Im Leid*. Edited by Manfred Oeming and Konrad Schmid. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2001.
- Ogden, Graham S. "Moses and Cyrus." *VT* 28, no. 2 (1978): 195–203.
- Oppenheim, A. Leo. "Idiomatic Accadian (Lexicographical Researches)." *JAOS* 61, no. 4 (1941): 251–71.
- . "The Position of the Intellectual in Mesopotamian Society." *Daedalus* 104, no. 2 (1975): 37–46.
- Orr, Mary. *Intertextuality Debates and Contexts*. Cambridge: Polity, 2003.
- Oswalt, John N. *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 40–66*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Paas, Stefan. *Creation and Judgement: Creation Texts in Some Eighth Century Prophets*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Parker, Simon B. *The Pre-Biblical Narrative Tradition: Essays on the Ugaritic Poems Keret and Aqhat*. RBS 24. Atlanta: Scholars, 1989.
- Parkinson, Richard B. "Individual and Society in Middle Kingdom Literature." Pages 137–55 in *Ancient Egyptian Literature: History and Forms*. Edited by Antonio Loprieno. Probleme der Ägyptologie 10. Leiden; NY: Brill, 1996.
- . *Poetry and Culture in Middle Kingdom Egypt: A Dark Side to Perfection*. Oakville: Equinox Pub. Ltd, 2010.
- . *The Tale of Sinuhe and Other Ancient Egyptian Poems, 1940–1640 BC*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1997.
- . "Types of Literature in the Middle Kingdom." Pages 297–312 in *Ancient Egyptian Literature: History and Forms*. Edited by Antonio Loprieno. Probleme der Ägyptologie 10. Leiden; NY: Brill, 1996.
- . *Voices from Ancient Egypt: An Anthology of Middle Kingdom Writings*. London: British Museum, 1991.
- Parpola, Simo. *Assyrian Prophecies*. SAA 9. Helsinki: Helsinki UP, 1997.
- . *Letters from Assyrian Scholars to the Kings Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal*. AOAT Bd. 5/1–5/2. Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker, 1970.
- Patrick, Dale. "Epiphanic Imagery in Second Isaiah's Portrayal of a New Exodus." *HAR* 8 (1984): 125–41.
- Paul, Shalom M. "Deutero-Isaiah and Cuneiform Royal Inscriptions." Pages 180–86 in *Essays in Memory of E. A. Speiser*. New Haven, Conn: AOS, 1968.
- . "Deuteronom(ist)ic Influences on Deutero-Isaiah." Pages 219–27 in *Mishneh Todah*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009.
- . *Isaiah 40–66: Translation and Commentary*. The Eerdmans Critical Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2011.
- . "Literary and Ideological Echoes of Jeremiah in Deutero-Isaiah." Pages 102–20 in *Proceedings of the 5th World Congress of Jewish Studies, v 1, Hebrew Univ, Jerusalem, 1969*. Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1973.
- Pearce, Laurie E. "'Judean': A Special Status in Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid Babylonia?." Pages 267–77 in *Judah and the Judeans in the Achaemenid Period*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011.
- . "New Evidence for Judeans in Babylonia." Pages 399–411 in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*. IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006.
- . "The Scribes and Scholars of Ancient Mesopotamia." *CANE, Vol 4*. NY: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1995.

- Perdue, Leo G. "Creation in the Dialogues between Job and His Opponents." Pages 197–216 in *Das Buch Hiob Und Seine Interpretationen: Beiträge Zum Hiob-Symposium Auf Dem Monte Verità Vom 14.-19. August 2005*. Edited by Thomas Krüger, Manfred Oeming, Konrad Schmid, and Christoph Uehlinger. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments. Zürich: TVZ, 2007.
- . "Sages, Scribes, and Seers in Israel and the Ancient Near East: An Introduction." Pages 1–34 in *Scribes, Sages, and Seers*. Edited by Leo G. Perdue. FRLANT Heft. 219. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008.
- , ed. *Scribes, Sages, and Seers: The Sage in the Eastern Mediterranean World*. FRLANT Heft. 219. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008.
- . *The Sword and the Stylus: An Introduction to Wisdom in the Age of Empires*. Grand Rapids, MI; Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans, 2008.
- . *Wisdom & Creation: The Theology of Wisdom Literature*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1994.
- . *Wisdom in Revolt: Metaphorical Theology in the Book of Job*. JSOT 112. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1991.
- . *Wisdom Literature: A Theological History*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2007.
- Peterson, Stephen Lee. "Babylonian Literary Influence in Deutero-Isaiah: A Bibliographic and Critical Study." PhD, Vanderbilt University, 1975.
- Pfeiffer, Robert H. "Edomitic Wisdom." *ZAW* 44, no. 1 (1926): 13–25.
- . *Introduction to the Old Testament*. London: Black, 1952.
- . "The Dual Origin of Hebrew Monotheism." *JBL* 46, no. 3–4 (1927): 193–206.
- Phillips, Morgan L. "Divine Self-Predication in Deutero-Isaiah." *BR* 16 (1971): 32–51.
- Plett, Heinrich F. "Intertextualities." Pages 3–29 in *Intertextuality*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1991.
- Polak, Frank H. "The Covenant at Mount Sinai in the Light of Texts from Mari." Pages 119–34 in *Sefer Moshe: The Moshe Weinfeld Jubilee Volume: Studies in the Bible and the Ancient Near East, Qumran, and Post-Biblical Judaism*. Edited by Chaim Cohen, Avi Hurvitz, and Shalom M. Paul. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2004.
- Polaski, Donald C. "Reflections on a Mosaic Covenant: The Eternal Covenant (Isaiah 24:5) and Intertextuality." *JSOT*, no. 77 (1998): 55–73.
- Pope, Marvin H. "Isaiah 34 in Relation to Isaiah 35,40–66." *JBL* 71, no. 4 (1952): 235–43.
- . *Job*. AB 15. NY: Doubleday, 1965.
- Porten, Bezalel. *Archives from Elephantine: The Life of an Ancient Jewish Military Colony*. Berkeley: University of California, 1968.
- . "Settlement of the Jews at Elephantine and the Arameans at Syene." Pages 451–70 in *Judah and the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period*. Edited by Oded Lipschits and Joseph Blenkinsopp. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2003.
- . "The Jews in Egypt." Pages 342–400 in *The Cambridge History of Judaism*. Edited by W. D. Davies and Louis Finkelstein. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984.
- Porteous, N. W. "Jerusalem - Zion: The Growth of a Symbol." Pages 235–52 in *Verbannung Und Heimkehr*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1961.
- Pritchard, James Bennett, ed. *ANET*. 3rd ed. with supplement. Princeton: Princeton, 1969.
- Purvis, James D. "Exile and Return: From the Babylonian Destruction to the Reconstruction of the Jewish State." Pages 151–75 in *Ancient Israel*. Washington, DC: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1988.
- Pyeon, Yohan. *You Have Not Spoken What Is Right About Me: Intertextuality and the Book of Job*. NY: Peter Lang, 2003.
- Rabinowitz, Louis Isaac, and Stephen G. Wald. "Talmud, Jerusalem." *EJ*, 2007.
- Ragazzoli, Chloé C. D. "The Social Creation of a Scribal Place: The Visitors' Inscriptions in the Tomb Ttributed to Antefiqer (TT 60)." *SAK Band* 42. H. Buske Verlag, 2014.
- Rendtorff, Rolf. "Isaiah 6 in the Framework of the Composition of the Book." Pages 170–80 in *Canon and Theology: Overtures to an Old Testament Theology*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.
- Richter, Heinz. "Die Naturweisheit Des Alten Testaments in Buche Hiob." *ZAW* 70, no. 1–2 (1958): 1–20.
- Ringgren, Helmer. *Religions of the Ancient Near East*. Translated by John Sturdy. London: SPCK, 1973.

- Roberts, J. J. M. "The Hand of Yahweh." *VT* 21, no. 2 (1971): 244–51.
- Rogland, Max. "The Covenant in the Book of Job." *CTR* 7, no. 1 (2009): 49–62.
- Rollston, Christopher A. *Writing and Literacy in the World of Ancient Israel: Epigraphic Evidence from the Iron Age*. ABS 11. Atlanta: SBL, 2010.
- Römer, Thomas C. "Yhwh, the Goddess and Evil: Is 'Monotheism' an Adequate Concept to Describe the Hebrew Bible's Discourses about the God of Israel?" *Verbum et Ecclesia* 34, no. 2 (2013). <http://www.ve.org.za/index.php/VE/article/view/841>.
- Rowold, Henry. "Yahweh's Challenge to Rival: The Form and Function of the Yahweh-Speech in Job 38-39." *CBQ* 47, no. 2 (1985): 199–211.
- Rudman, Dominic. "Determinism and Anti-Determinism in the Book of Koheleth." *JBQ* 30, no. 2 (2002): 97–106.
- . *Determinism in the Book of Ecclesiastes*. JSOTSup. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001.
- Saggs, H. W. F. *The Encounter with the Divine in Mesopotamia and Israel*. JLCR 12. London: Athlone, 1978.
- Sandmel, Samuel. "Parallelomania." *JBL* 81, no. 1 (1962): 1–13.
- Sarna, Nahum M. "Some Instances of the Enclitic -M in Job." *JJS* 6, no. 2 (1955): 108–10.
- Sarot, Marcel. "Theodicy and Modernity." Pages 1–26 in *Theodicy in the World of the Bible*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Saussure, Ferdinand de. *Course in General Linguistics*. Edited by Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye. Translated by Roy Harris. London: Duckworth, 1983.
- Sawyer, John F. A. "Daughter of Zion and Servant of the Lord in Isaiah: A Comparison." *JSOT*, no. 44 (1989): 89–107.
- Schaeder, Hans Heinrich. *Esra Der Schreiber*. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 5. Tübingen: Mohr, 1930.
- Schams, Christine. *Jewish Scribes in the Second-Temple Period*. JSOTSup 291. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998.
- Schaper, Joachim. "On Writing and Reciting in Jeremiah 36." Pages 137–47 in *Prophecy in the Book of Jeremiah*. Edited by Hans M. Barstad and Reinhard Gregor Kratz. BZAW 388. Berlin; NY: Walter de Gruyter, 2009.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. *Understanding Second Temple and Rabbinic Judaism*. Jersey City, NJ: Ktav, 2003.
- Schmid, Konrad. "Innerbiblische Schriftdiskussion Im Hiobbuch." Pages 241–61 in *Das Buch Hiob Und Seine Interpretationen: Beiträge Zum Hiob-Symposium Auf Dem Monte Verità Vom 14.-19. August 2005*. ATANT. Zürich: TVZ, 2007.
- . "The Authors of Job and Their Historical and Social Setting." Pages 145–53 in *Scribes, Sages, and Seers*. Edited by Leo G. Perdue. FRLANT Heft. 219. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008.
- Schniedewind, William M. *How the Bible Became a Book: The Textualization of Ancient Israel*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004.
- . "In Conversation with W. M. Schniedewind, How the Bible Became a Book: The Textualization of Ancient Israel (Cambridge, 2003)." Edited by David M. Carr, Tamara Cohn Eskenazi, Christine Mitchell, and Gary N. Knoppers. *JHS* 5 (2005): 44–56.
- Schoors, Antoon. *I Am God Your Saviour: A Form-Critical Study of the Maingenres in Is. XL-LV*. SVT 24. Leiden: Brill, 1973.
- . "(Mis)use of Intertextuality in Qoheleth Exegesis." Pages 45–59 in *Congress Volume*. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Schultz, Richard L. "Job and Ecclesiastes: Intertextuality and a Protesting Pair." Pages 190–203 in *Reading Job Intertextually*. NY: T&T Clark, 2013.
- . "Unity or Diversity in Wisdom Theology? A Canonical and Covenantal Perspective." *TB* 48, no. 2 (1997): 271–306.
- Seitz, Christopher R. "Isaiah 40-66." Pages 307–552 in *The New Interpreter's Bible: General Articles & Introduction, Commentary, & Reflections for Each Book of the Bible, Including the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books in Twelve Volumes*. VI vols. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1994.

- . “The Divine Council: Temporal Transition and New Prophecy in the Book of Isaiah.” *JBL* 109, no. 2 (1990): 229–47.
- . *Zion’s Final Destiny: The Development of the Book of Isaiah: A Reassessment of Isaiah 36–39*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.
- Sekine, Seizo. *Die Tritojesajanische Sammlung - Jes 56-66 - Redaktionsgeschichtlich Untersucht*. BZAW 175. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1989.
- Seow, C. L. *Job 1–21: Interpretation and Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2013.
- . “Linguistic Evidence and the Dating of Qoheleth.” *JBL* 115, no. 4 (1996): 643–66.
- Sheldon, Linda Jean. “The Book of Job as Hebrew Theodicy: An Ancient Near Eastern Intertextual Conflict Between Law and Cosmology.” PhD, University of California, Berkeley, 2002.
- Shields, M. A. “Wisdom and Prophecy.” Edited by Tremper Longman III and Peter Enns. *DOTWPW*. IVP, 2008.
- Shupak, Nili. “Egyptian ‘Prophecy’ and Biblical Prophecy: Did the Phenomenon of Prophecy, in the Biblical Sense, Exist in Ancient Egypt ?” *JEOL*, no. 31 (1989): 5–40.
- . “Egyptian ‘Prophetic’ Writings and Biblical Wisdom Literature.” *BN*, no. 54 (1990): 81–102.
- . *Where Can Wisdom Be Found?: The Sage’s Language in the Bible and in Ancient Egyptian Literature*. OBO 130. Fribourg, Switzerland: Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993.
- Snaith, Norman Henry. *The Book of Job: Its Origin and Purpose*. SBT 11. London: SCM, 1968.
- Sommer, Benjamin D. “Allusions and Illusions: The Unity of the Book of Isaiah in Light of Deutero-Isaiah’s Use of Prophetic Tradition.” Pages 156–86 in *New Visions of Isaiah*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- . *A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40–66*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1998.
- . “Exegesis, Allusion and Intertextuality in the Hebrew Bible: A Response to Lyle Eslinger.” *VT* 46, no. 4 (1996): 479–89.
- . “New Light on the Composition of Jeremiah.” *CBQ* 61, no. 4 (1999): 646–66.
- Spangenberg, Izak. “Who Cares? Reflections on the Story of the Ostrich (Job 39.13–18).” Pages 92–102 in *The Earth Story in Wisdom Traditions*. Edited by Norman C. Habel and Shirley Wurst. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001.
- Speiser, E. A. “The Case of the Obliging Servant.” *JCA* 8, no. 3 (1954): 98–105.
- Stead, Michael R. *The Intertextuality of Zechariah 1–8*. LHB/OTS 506. NY; London: T&T Clark, 2009.
- Stipp, Hermann-Josef. “Probleme Des Redaktionsgeschichtlichen Modells Der Entstehung Des Jeremiabuches.” Pages 225–62 in *Jeremia Und Die “Deuteronomistische Bewegung.”* Edited by Walter Gross. Bonner biblische Beiträge Bd. 98. Weinheim: Beltz, Athenäum, 1995.
- Stone, Michael E. “Apocalyptic Literature.” Pages 383–441 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran, Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*. Edited by Michael E. Stone. CRINT 2. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984.
- Stromberg, Jacob. *Isaiah after Exile: The Author of Third Isaiah as Reader and Redactor of the Book*. OTM. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2011.
- Stummer, Friedrich. “Einige Keilschriftliche Parallelen Zu Jes.40–66.” *JBL* 45, no. 1–2 (1926): 171–89.
- . *Sumerisch-Akkadische Parallelen Zum Aufbau Alttestamentlicher Psalmen*. SGKA 11. Bd., 1./2. Hft. Paderborn: F. Schöningh, 1922.
- Terrien, Samuel L. “Amos and Wisdom.” Pages 448–55 in *Studies in Ancient Israelite Wisdom*. Edited by James L. Crenshaw. LBS. NY: Ktav, 1976.
- . *Job*. 2e éd. actualisée. Commentaire de l’Ancien Testament 13. Genève: Labor et Fides, 2005.
- . “Job as a Sage.” Pages 231–42 in *Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- . “Quelques Remarques Sur Les Affinités de Job Avec Le Deutéro-Esaïe.” Pages 295–310 in *Volume Du Congrès, Genève, 1965*. VTSup 15. Leiden: Brill, 1966.

- . “The Book of Job: Introduction and Exegesis.” Pages 877–905 in *IB*. III. NY: Abingdon Press, 1951.
- . *The Elusive Presence: Toward a New Biblical Theology*. RP 26. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1978.
- Thiel, Winfried. *Die Deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1-25*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament Bd. 41. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1973.
- . *Die Deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 26-45*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament Bd. 52. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981.
- Tiemeyer, Lena-Sofia. “A Busy Night in the Heavenly Court.” *SEA* 71 (2006): 187–207.
- Tov, Emanuel. *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*. STDJ 54. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2004.
- Tull, Patricia K. “Intertextuality and the Hebrew Scriptures.” *CR: BS* 8 (2000).
- Turner, Mary Donovan. “Daughter Zion: Lament and Restoration.” PhD, Emory University, 1992.
- Tur-Sinai, Naphtali H. *The Book of Job: A New Commentary*. Jerusalem: Kiryath Sepher, 1967.
- Vall, Gregory. “The Enigma of Job 1,21a.” *Biblica* 76, no. 3 (1995): 325–42.
- Van der Toorn, Karel. *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible*. Cambridge, MA, and London: Harvard UP, 2009.
- . “The Ancient Near Eastern Literary Dialogue as a Vehicle of Critical Reflection.” Pages 59–75 in *Dispute Poems and Dialogues in the Ancient and Mediaeval Near East*. Louvain: Departement Oriëntalistiek, 1991.
- . “Theodicy in Akkadian Literature.” Pages 57–89 in *Theodicy in the World of the Bible*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Van Seters, John. “Oral Patterns or Literary Conventions in Biblical Narrative.” *Semeia*, no. 5 (1976): 139–54.
- . “The Role of the Scribe in the Making of the Hebrew Bible.” *JANER* 8, no. 1 (2008): 99–129.
- Vassar, John S. *Recalling a Story Once Told: An Intertextual Reading of the Psalter and the Pentateuch*. Macon, GA: Mercer UP, 2007.
- Von Rad, Gerhard. *Old Testament Theology*. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. 2. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1965.
- Von Soden, W. “Das Fragen Nach Der Gerichtigkeit Gottes Im Alten Orient.” *MDOG* 96 (1965): 41–59.
- Vanderhooft, David Stephen. *The Neo-Babylonian Empire and Babylon in the Latter Prophets*. HSM 59. Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1999.
- Vanhoozer, Kevin J. *Is There a Meaning in This Text?: The Bible, the Reader, and the Morality of Literary Knowledge*. Leicester: Apollos, 1998.
- Visicato, Giuseppe. *The Power and the Writing: The Early Scribes of Mesopotamia*. Bethesda, MD: CDL, 2000.
- Waldman, Nahum M. “A Biblical Echo of Mesopotamian Royal Rhetoric.” Pages 449–55 in *Essays on the Occasion of the Seventieth Anniversary of the Dropsie University*. Philadelphia: Dropsie University, 1979.
- Walton, John H. *Ancient Israelite Literature in Its Cultural Context: A Survey of Parallels Between Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Texts*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1990.
- Watts, John D. W. *Isaiah 34-66*. WBC 25. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2005.
- Weeks, Stuart. *An Introduction to the Study of Wisdom Literature*. London: T&T Clark, 2010.
- . *Early Israelite Wisdom*. OTMs. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999.
- . *Ecclesiastes and Scepticism*. NY: T&T Clark, 2012.
- . *Instruction and Imagery in Proverbs 1-9*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007.
- . “Literacy, Orality, and Literature in Israel.” Pages 465–78 in *On Stone and Scroll: Essays in Honour of Graham Ivor Davies*. Edited by James K. Aitken, Katharine J. Dell, and Brian A. Mastin. BZAW Bd. 420. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 2011.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1972.

- . “God the Creator in Gen. 1 and in the Prophecy of Second Isaiah.” *Tarbiz* 33 (1968): 105–32.
- . “Job and Its Mesopotamian Parallels - A Typological Analysis.” Pages 217–26 in *Text and Context*. Sheffield: JSOT, 1988.
- . “The Covenant of Grant in the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East.” *JAOS* 90, no. 2 (1970): 184–203.
- Weippert, Manfred. “Aspekte Israelischer Prophetie Im Lichte Verwandter Erscheinungen Des Alten Orients.” Pages 287–319 in *Ad Bene et Fideliter Seminandum: Festgabe Für Karlheinz Deller Zum 21. Februar 1987*. Edited by Ursula Magen and Gerlinde Mauer. AOAT Bd. 220. Kevelaer: Neukirchen-Vluyn; Butzon & Bercker; Neukirchener Verlag, 1988.
- . “Assyrische Prophetien Der Zeit Asarhaddons Und Assurbanipals.” Pages 71–115 in *Assyrian Royal Inscriptions: New Horizons in Literary, Ideological and Historical Analysis: Papers of a Symposium Held in Cetona (Siena) June 26-28, 1980*. Edited by Frederick Mario Fales. OAC 17. Roma: Istituto per l’Oriente, 1981.
- . “‘Das Frühere, Siehe, Ist Eingetroffen...’: Über Selbstzitate Im Altorientalischen Prophetenspruch.” Pages 147–69 in *Oracles et Prophéties Dans l’Antiquité*. Paris: De Boccard, 1997.
- . “De Herkomst van Het Heilsorakel Voor Israël Bij Deutero-Jesaja.” *NTT* 36, no. 1 (1982): 1–11.
- . “‘Ich Bin Jahwe’--‘Ich Bin Ištar von Arbela’: Deuterojesaja Im Lichte Der Neuassyrischen Prophetie.” Pages 31–59 in *Prophetie Und Psalmen*. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2001.
- Wente, Edward F. “The Scribes of Ancient Egypt.” *CANE, Vol 4*. NY: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1995.
- Westermann, Claus. *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech*. London: Lutterworth, 1967.
- . *Genesis 1-11: A Continental Commentary*. Translated by John Scullion. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994.
- . *Isaiah 40-66: A Commentary*. OTL. London: SCM Press, 1969.
- . *The Praise of God in the Psalms*. London: Epworth Press, 1966.
- Weyde, Karl William. “Inner-Biblical Interpretation: Methodological Reflections on the Relationship between Texts in the Hebrew Bible.” *SEÁ* 70 (2005): 287–300.
- Whedbee, J. William. *Isaiah & Wisdom*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1971.
- Whybray, R. N. *The Heavenly Counsellor in Isaiah XI 13-14: A Study of the Sources of the Theology of Deutero-Isaiah*. SOTSMS 1. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1971.
- . *The Intellectual Tradition in the Old Testament*. BZAW 135. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1974.
- Wildberger, Hans. “Der Monotheismus Deuterojesajas.” Pages 506–30 in *Beiträge Zur Alttestamentlichen Theologie*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977.
- Wiley, Patricia Tull. *Remember the Former Things: The Recollection of Previous Texts in Second Isaiah*. SBLDS 161. Atlanta: SBL, 1997.
- Williamson, H. G. M. *Ezra, Nehemiah*. WBC 16. Waco Texas: Word Books, 1985.
- . *The Book Called Isaiah: Deutero-Isaiah’s Role in Composition and Redaction*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005.
- . *Variations on a Theme: King, Messiah and Servant in the Book of Isaiah*. Didsbury Lectures 1997. Carlisle: Paternoster, 1998.
- Williams, R. J. “Theodicy in the Ancient Near East.” Pages 42–56 in *Theodicy in the Old Testament*. Edited by James L. Crenshaw. IRT 4. Philadelphia: London: Fortress; SPCK, 1983.
- Wilson, Robert R. “Current Issues in the Study of Old Testament Prophecy.” Pages 38–46 in *Inspired Speech: Prophecy in the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of Herbert B. Huffmon*. Edited by John Kaltner and Louis Stulman. JSOT. London; NY: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Witte, Markus. “Does the Torah Keep Its Promise? Job’s Critical Intertextual Dialogue with Deuteronomy.” Pages 54–65 in *Reading Job Intertextually*. NY: T&T Clark, 2013.
- Worton, Michael, and Judith Still. “Introduction.” Pages 1–44 in *Intertextuality: Theories and Practices*. Manchester: NY: Manchester UP, 1990.

- Young, Ian. "Biblical Texts Cannot Be Dated Linguistically." *HS* 46 (2005): 341–51.
- . *Diversity in Pre-Exilic Hebrew*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 5. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1993.
- . "Israelite Literacy: Interpreting the Evidence: Part1." *VT* 48, no. 2 (1998): 239–53.
- . "Israelite Literacy: Interpreting the Evidence: Part2." *VT* 48, no. 3 (1998): 408–22.
- . "Is the Prose Tale of Job in Late Biblical Hebrew?" *VT* 59, no. 4 (2009): 606–29.
- Young, Ian, Robert Rezetko, and Martin Ehrensverd. *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts*. London: Equinox, 2008.
- Zimmerli, Walther. "Der 'Neue Exodus' in Der Verkündigung Der Beiden Grossen Exilspropheten." Pages 192–204 in *Gottes Offenbarung: Gesammelte Aufsätze Zum Alten Testament*. Theologische Bücherei Bd. 19. München: C. Kaiser, 1963.
- . "Ich Bin Yahweh." Pages 179–209 in *Geschichte Und Altes Testament: Albrecht Alt Zum 70. Geburtstag Dargebracht*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1953.